Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-119
Thursday
22 June 1989

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-119 *22 June 1989*

CONTENTS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Soviet Army Unit Begins Withdrawing From CSSR *[TASS]* 1
Inspectors in Denmark To Observe NATO Exercises *[TASS]* 1
Nazarkin Stresses Arms Reductions, ABM Link *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 21 Jun]* 1
Bush Statement, U.S. Arms Talks Position Viewed 1
MX, Midgetman Remark 'Not Fortuitous' *[Alekseyev on Moscow Radio]* 1
USSR Stand 'More Constructive' *[PRAVDA 21 Jun]* 1
'Inconsistency' Noted in U.S. Stand *[Tsvetov on Moscow TV]* 2
'Pressure Tactics' in U.S. Proposal *[Solton on Moscow International]* 2
Geneva Disarmament Negotiations Agenda Reviewed *[Solovyev in SELSKAYA ZHIZN 16 Jun]* 2
Defense Department Aide Cited on INF Monitoring *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 18 Jun]* 3
UN Negotiators Welcome Gorbachev Bonn Talks *[IZVESTIYA 15 Jun]* 3
Charges of 'Obsolete' Arms Scrapping Rebutted *[PRAVDA 18 Jun]* 4

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Ryzhkov Sends Greeting to 'Group-77' Countries *[TASS]* 5
Six-Country Initiative Declaration Published *[PRAVDA 21 Jun]* 5
Gorbachev Reply Handed to Envoys *[PRAVDA 21 Jun]* 6
18th Congress of Socialist International Opens 6
Brutents, Veber Leave for Sweden *[PRAVDA 19 Jun]* 6
Brutents, Brandt Hold Talks *[TASS]* 6
CPSU Message to Congress *[PRAVDA 20 Jun]* 6
Bloc Countries To Attend Council of Europe *[PRAVDA 10 Jun]* 7
'Repercussions' on European Ties, Visa Issues *[Moscow TV]* 7

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Adm Crowe Meets With Gorbachev, Ends USSR Visit 17
Crowe, Gorbachev Cited Before Talks *[Moscow TV]* 17
PRAVDA Reports Talks *[22 Jun]* 17
Crowe Speaks at News Conference *[TASS]* 18
Crowe Flies Home 22 Jun *[TASS]* 18

China

PRC Minister Cited on Foreign Economic Ties *[IZVESTIYA 18 Jun]* 18
Eight Sentenced To Death for Beijing 'Revolt' *[PRAVDA 19 Jun]* 19
Efforts To Restore Order Outlined *[TASS]* 19

Northeast Asia

U.S. Delivery of Arms to South Korea Criticized *[Golts in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 15 Jun]* 19
Origins of Postwar Japanese Reforms Viewed *[Tsvetov in ARGUMENTY I FAKTY No 24]* 20

Southeast Asia & Pacific

SRV Defense Minister Arrives in USSR 21 Jun *[TASS]* 21
SRV Minister Cited on Troops Leaving Cambodia *[TASS]* 22
Yazov Greets Cambodia's Tie Banh on Army Day *[Phnom Penh Radio]* 22
Pol Pot Resignation Termed 'Farcical' *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 13 Jun]* 22
USSR To Consider ASEAN-Superpowers 'Hot Line' *[Kuala Lumpur BERNAMA 19 Jun]* 23

Near East & South Asia

Further Reportage on Visit by Hashemi-Rafsanjani 23
Declaration on Principles of Relations *[TASS]* 23
Talks Continue 21 Jun *[PRAVDA 22 Jun]* 24
Gorbachev's 21 Jun Dinner Speech *[PRAVDA 22 Jun]* 25
Hashemi-Rafsanjani Speaks *[PRAVDA 22 Jun]* 26
Hashemi-Rafsanjani Addresses News Conference *[TASS]* 27
Hashemi-Rafsanjani Visits 'Mir' Center *[Tehran Radio]* 28
Extends Visit to USSR *[Tehran TV]* 28
Gorbachev Bids Hashemi-Rafsanjani Farewell *[TASS]* 28
Guest Seen Off to Leningrad 22 Jun *[TASS]* 28
USSR, Iranian Delegation Officials Meet 29
Shevardnadze, Velayati Meet *[Tehran IRNA]* 29
Silayev Meets Iranian Minister Nabavi *[TASS]* 29
Commentary Views Hashemi-Rafsanjani's Visit *[Krasnov on Moscow International]* 29
Najibullah Addresses Afghan Military Commanders *[TASS]* 30
Pakistani Minister Receives USSR POW Group *[TASS]* 30
Ambassador Discusses Fate of POWs in Afghanistan *[IZVESTIYA 18 Jun]* 31

Sub-Saharan Africa

Commentary Views Sudanese Coup Attempt *[Moscow International]* 32
Ethiopia's Mengistu Receives USSR Official *[TASS]* 33
USSR Responsibility for Ethiopian Situation Noted *[Moscow TV]* 33
Shengo's Eritrean Peace Initiative Praised *[Moscow International]* 33
Adamishin, Burundi Foreign Minister Meet 21 Jun *[Moscow International]* 34
Preferential Trade Area Meeting Held in Arusha *[Moscow International]* 34
Angolan Party Auditing Experts Study CPSU Work *[PRAVDA 15 Jun]* 34

East Europe

Gerasimov Clarifies Soviet Stance on Nagy Burial *[Budapest Radio]* 34
'Vociferous' Anti-Soviet Demonstration in Krakow *[TASS]* 35
Zaykov, GDR's Schabowski Open Berlin Festival *[MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA 1 Jun]* 35
Solovyev Meets With Dresden Delegation *[Moscow Radio]* 37
Poland-GDR Sea Border Dispute Settled *[IZVESTIYA 15 Jun]* 37

West Europe

Turkish, U.S. Stance on MiG Hijacking Criticized *[Matveyev in IZVESTIYA 15 Jun]* 38
New UK Labour Party Platform, Elections Viewed *[PRAVDA 17 Jun]* 39

Latin America & Caribbean

Further Reportage on Vorotnikov's Visit to Brazil 41
Vorotnikov Meets Sao Paulo Businessmen *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 17 Jun]* 41
Comments on Visit Before Departure *[IZVESTIYA 19 Jun]* 42
Delegation Returns to Moscow *[Moscow TV]* 42
Joint 'Announcement' on Soviet-Brazilian Talks *[IZVESTIYA 19 Jun]* 43

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Political & Social

Supreme Soviet Committees, Commissions Meet *[IZVESTIYA 21 Jun]* 45
Chazov Approved as Health Minister *[Moscow Radio]* 47
Georgian Commission on 9 Apr Tbilisi Events Meets 48
'Special Commission' Organized *[ZARYA VOSTOKA 7 Jun]* 48
Commission's 'Preliminary Findings' *[ZARYA VOSTOKA 11 Jun]* 48

Further Information on Novyy Uzen Disturbances 48
'Extremists' Kindling Conflict *[Alma-Ata Radio]* 54
Reasons for Disturbances Listed *[TASS]* 54
Alma-Ata Radio Describes Situation 55
Baku Radio Reports on Novyy Uzen 55
Situation 'Normal' on Surface *[PRAVDA 22 Jun]* 55
Nazarbayev Replaces Kolbin as Kazakh Party Head *[TASS]* 56
Personality Profile of Yegor Ligachev Published *[Sofia POGLED 12 Jun]* 56
Ligachev Speech, Article Collection Published *[Moscow Radio]* 58
Further Reports on Fergana Oblast Disturbances 58
Officials 'Unprepared' for Crisis *[SOVETSKAYA KULTURA 15 Jun]* 58
Underlying Causes Speculated Upon *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 21 Jun]* 59
Arrests Continue; Death Toll at 98 *[PRAVDA 21 Jun]* 61
Uzbek Draft Language Law Published for Discussion *[PRAVDA 20 Jun]* 61
Racial Clashes Rooted in Stalin Era *[IZVESTIYA 16 Jun]* 62
Disregard for Student Demands Prompts Unrest *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 14 Jun]* 63
Investigation Into Bashkiria Train Wreck Continues
[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 15 Jun] 64
Monument to Victims Planned *[PRAVDA 15 Jun]* 65
USSR Can Learn From American Legal System *[IZVESTIYA 12 Jun]* 65
IAEA Expert 'Confident' of AES Design *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 20 Jun]* 68
Rumors of Zaporozhye AES Problems Refuted
[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 17 Jun] 70
Mishandling of Unused Radioactive Devices Discussed *[PRAVDA 13 Jun]* 71
Chairman Salykov on Role of New Ecology Committee *[IZVESTIYA 14 Jun]* 71
Health Ministry 'Guilty' in Spread of AIDS *[Moscow TV]* 73
Independent Paper To Be Published 'This Month' *[Moscow TV]* 74

Economic

Minister Interviewed on Defense Sector Conversion *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 14 Jun]* 74

Agricultural

Agricultural Developments for 15-20 Jun Reported *[Moscow Radio]* 76

Soviet Army Unit Begins Withdrawing From CSSR

LD2006164289 Moscow TASS in English 1602 GMT 20 Jun 89

[Text] Prague June 20 TASS—The pull-out of another Soviet Army unit from Czechoslovak territory was started today.

In a rally in Olomouc, attended by representatives of the Czechoslovak public and Czechoslovak People's Army servicemen, speakers thanked the Soviet troops for their good deeds.

The loading of the first train was started after the ceremony.

Four units numbering 1,500 men, 192 tanks and 20 combat aircraft will be withdrawn from Czechoslovakia this year.

Inspectors in Denmark To Observe NATO Exercises

LD2106104489 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0958 GMT 21 Jun 89

[Text] Copenhagen, 21 Jun (TASS)—In accordance with the documents of the Stockholm conference, a group of Soviet officers arrived in Denmark today to conduct an inspection of the NATO mobile forces exercises "Avenue Express 89."

Nazarkin Stresses Arms Reductions, ABM Link

PM2106110989 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 21 Jun 89 First Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Ready for Talks"]

[Text] Geneva, 20 Jun—A meeting between delegation heads Ambassador Yu.K. Nazarkin and Ambassador R. Burt here marked the resumption of Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space arms. The head of the USSR delegation spoke at a briefing for journalists held afterwards.

"We arrived in Geneva well armed for serious talks on the entire package of problems which remain unsolved and will actively promote the quest for mutually acceptable solutions," he said. They include linking the 50-percent reduction in strategic offensive weapons with the observance of the Anti-Ballistic Missile [ABM] Treaty. This interconnection, the Soviet representative emphasized, is an objective reality rather than our invention. Questions concerning the limitation of air- and sea-launched long-range cruise missiles, heavy bombers, and effective monitoring in observance of the accords to be reached also await a solution.

Bush Statement, U.S. Arms Talks Position Viewed

MX, Midgetman Remark 'Not Fortuitous'

LD2206004789 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 2045 GMT 21 Jun 89

[From the "International Diary" program, presented by Georgiy Alekseyev]

[Text] The first plenary meeting of the Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva on nuclear and space weapons was held Wednesday [21 June]. The heads of the delegations outlined their positions on the problems being discussed and agreed on the organization of work during the current round of talks. As Ambassador Nazarkin, head of the Soviet delegation, stated the Soviet representatives have arrived in Geneva in a businesslike and constructive mood, full of desire to seek mutually acceptable solutions to unresolved questions. The position of the U.S. side, as reported, has undergone certain changes. From its point of view, during this round of talks it is necessary to lay special emphasis on montoring procedures.

Therefore, observers' attention has immediately been drawn to the statement U.S. President Bush made at a meeting with congressional leaders. The President stressed in particular the importance of financing simultaneously the deployment of MX missiles on railway platforms and continuing the "Midgetman" mobile ballistic missile program. Bush made it clear that this is a constituent part of the U.S. general position on arms control and the modernization of strategic nuclear forces of the United States. But as everyone knows, mobile systems are the most complex with regard to control and verification. Therefore, it is not fortuitous that a journalist, with whom Senator Nunn talked after the meeting between Bush and congressmen, wondered why the United States while at the start of a new era in relations with the USSR, is at the same time embarking upon developing a new missile. The senator's reply amounted to the fact that with the resumption of the talks on reducing strategic nuclear forces, it is important for the President to have congressional support. According to Nunn, this is not a bargaining chip but a sensible step.

USSR Stand 'More Constructive'

PM2106113789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Jun 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report under the general heading: "Talks Resumed"]

[Text] Washington, 20 Jun—U.S. President George Bush issued a statement Monday on the beginning of the next round of Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space arms in Geneva. The document stresses that the U.S. delegation's instructions, which have presidential approval, confirm most of the wording of the treaty on a 50-percent reduction in U.S. and Soviet strategic offensive arms elaborated by the previous administration.

According to G. Bush, the procedures for monitoring observance of the document being drafted constitute, possibly, the "most complex" problem at the Geneva talks. At the same time the President indicated that the "maintenance of effective nuclear deterrence forces is important both for U.S. security and also for the U.S. capability to hold talks" on the elaboration of "reasonable agreements."

It was pointed out at Monday's press conference in Washington given by well-known U.S. arms control specialists that the Soviet stance at the Geneva talks appears much more constructive than the U.S. stance.

'Inconsistency' Noted in U.S. Stand

OW2106121089 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1010 GMT 21 Jun 89

["The World Today" program, presented by Vladimir Tsvetov]

[Text] U.S. President Bush has formulated the U.S. position at the Geneva talks on nuclear and space armaments. However, along with declaring the intention to aspire for a reduction in these armaments, Bush underscored the importance of continuing with the program of modernizing U.S. strategic nuclear forces. The president also stated his adherence to the SDI program and his intention to deploy this missile defense system when it is ready.

While Bush spoke at the White House, U.S. Secretary of State James Baker was making a speech at the U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee. He stressed U.S. readiness to develop a constructive dialogue and cooperation with the USSR in arms control and many other areas. Pointing at the revolutionary nature in the processes of change that are taking place in the Soviet Union, Baker said: We should be realistic and patient with the Soviet Union while making every effort to find out just how far cooperation can be developed. We intend to diligently work to achieve results in all areas.

What Baker called realism and patience, I would be inclined to call inconsistency and indecisiveness. In any case, the utterances made at the same time by Bush and Baker, leads to this conclusion.

'Pressure Tactics' in U.S. Proposal

LD2106154589 Moscow World Service in English 1110 GMT 21 Jun 89

[Text] At the Soviet-American talks in Geneva on nuclear and space weapons full-scale sessions have got under way. The negotiators are considering a draft treaty to cut by half strategic offensive arms in the context of compliance with the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty for a definite term. In the run up to the talks administration officials in Washington and the chief American negotiator in Geneva made official statements concerning the American position. Yuriy Solton now comments: It's an encouraging sign that the United States President said the signing of the treaty was one of the chief goals of his arms control policy. This goal is consonant with Moscow's intentions. However, some statements on individual issues, although made in general terms, left me in bewilderment. The American delegation argues that verification measures must be drawn up first and test inspections held. A strategic arms reduction treaty will be signed only if these measures prove effective.

There has been no reaction from the Soviet delegation to this proposal yet. At this point, says Yuriy Solton, I can only say that Moscow is interested in the most tough verification procedures to no smaller degree than Washington. Personally, says Yuriy Solton, I tend to support those who believe that establishing a verification system and testing it before it has been decided what is to be eliminated and how would be tantamount to putting the problem on its head. I am afraid that the American proposal is unlikely to speed up the negotiations, which have been going on since 1985.

Let me draw your attention to one more aspect. Imposing restrictions on the mobile land-based strategic missiles is one of the disputed points at the talks. The United States not long ago called for banning such missiles altogether. However, as he explained the administration's position at the Geneva negotiations to Congress leaders on Tuesday, President Bush requested major appropriations for deploying the 50 powerful MX missiles already built on railroad platforms and for developing new mobile strategic missiles of the Midgetman type. When the chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, Sam Nunn, said he was surprised, because the President's request disagreed with the United States' previous position at the talks, it was made clear to him that if Congress endorsed the scheme the United States would reconsider its position.

Anyone can easily judge the degree of the United States Adminstration's commitment to its principles. And the last point, the President himself and other United States officials in their statements concerning the Geneva negotiations have repeatedly reaffirmed their commitment to the policy from a position of strength. For instance, the President said it was important to go ahead with strategic nuclear arms modernization programs which, he said, was vital to creating better opportunities for achieving reasonable disarmament agreements.

To my mind it is not pressure tactics, but the search for mutual compromises meeting the interests of each other's security that is more likely to lead to success.

Geneva Disarmament Negotiations Agenda Reviewed

18070665 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian dd

[Article by Vladimir Solovyev under the rubric "Opinions of a Commentator": "Negotiations Roundtable"]

[Text] As was reported from Geneva, the disarmament conference has reopened its work. The agenda calls for preparing a draft convention on banning the processing,

production, stockpiling, and employment of all types of chemical weapons and their destruction, and discussions on the question of nuclear disarmament and a ban on nuclear testing. At the same time, the 11th round of Soviet-U.S. negotiations on a chemical weapons ban has begun there.

In getting acquainted with these telegrams, one automatically begins to think about one thing. In the postwar period, the world commuinity created a broad and extensive negotiating mechanism for disarmament and arms and armed forces limitation, in a word, to ensure peace and security. The number of different conferences, symosiums, meetings, forums, and bilateral and multilateral negotiations today is so large that even their simple correct designation becomes a problem for the nonspecialist.

It is no secret that the long negotiations, and frequently the frankly protracted character of many negotiations, gave rise to pessimism among some people as to their effectiveness. Incidentally, this was evident in our readers' letters which often contained critical remarks about "fruitless shop talk."

But I do not recall such letters in recent years. And the fact, of course, is not that literally everyone has sensed the complete complexity of diplomatic work. It is just that in recent years the return from the efforts of negotiation participants has increased sharply. Those nontypical approaches, which are given the pithy designation of "new political thinking," have also given negotiations a new quality. The atmosphere of trust is getting stronger from day to day. However, this is not occurring automatically, but precisely because of the parties' contributions to eliminating the consequences of the "cold war." In this sense, it is difficult to overestimate the significance of the current Soviet-West German dialogue at a high level, and the joint announcement of both countries.

There is no doubt that the chances for success in the current numerous negotiations on disarmament are greater than ever before. Whether they will be used to good effect depends on each of the participants.

Defense Department Aide Cited on INF Monitoring

PM2006140589 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 18 Jun 89 First Edition p 1

[TASS report: "Responsible Approach"]

[Text] Washington, 17 Jun—The skepticism the United States expressed concerning the reliability of monitoring the observance of the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles has not been substantiated . Brigadier General R. Lajoie, director of the U.S. Defense Department On-Site Inspection Agency, who spoke at a press conference in the U.S. capital, stated this. According to him, the work done by U.S. inspectors to monitor the USSR's observance of the treaty provisions showed that Soviet officials are demonstrating a responsible and professional approach to this question.

General R. Lajoie talked briefly about how the conditions of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles are being implemented by the Soviet and U.S. sides and talked about the participation in this process of the workers at the agency headed by him. Characterizing the atmosphere in which the activity of the U.S. inspectors on Soviet territory is being implemented, the U.S. general indicated that on the whole it was fine.

UN Negotiators Welcome Gorbachev Bonn Talks

PM2106131789 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Jun 89 Moscow Evening Edition p 4

[Special correspondent A. Anichkin report: "The Dagomys Conference: Avoiding an Artificial Pause"]

[Text] Debates at the UN regional conference on disarmament in Dagomys, a resort complex near Sochi, were at their height when news of the new important documents signed during M.S. Gorbachev's official visit to the FRG arrived there. The conference is actually attended by those experts whose painstaking work promotes the laying of foundations for security and stability in the world. It was, therefore, only natural thay they focused their attention on the course of the talks in Bonn.

"I am perfectly convinced that the meeting between the USSR and FRG leaders has made an important contribution to strengthening peace and stability in Europe," Enno Barker, leader of the FRG Foreign Ministry Department for Disarmament and Arms Limitation Issues, declared.

"This event is also very important for the other German state, the GDR," GDR Ambassador to Austria Guenther Buehring noted. "It will certainly further the development of a debate about the creation of a 'common European home.'"

The central item on the conference agenda was the development of the disarmament process following the conclusion of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles. The document was signed, missiles are being destroyed—what next?

"The Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles," V.P. Karpov, USSR deputy foreign minister, emphasized, "laid down methods for solving complex disarmament problems, and they are now being used to elaborate on a Soviet-U.S. treaty to reduce strategic offensive weapons by 50-percent in conjunction with observing the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty. We perceive everything that we have succeeded in achieving so far in the sphere of nuclear disarmament

as the very beginning of the serious work to curb the arms race. Now it is especially important to ensure continuity in the development of the disarmament process and to avoid artificial pauses and delays. The conclusion of a Soviet-U.S. treaty on strategic weapons is probably the top priority task in the sphere of implementing the program for a stage-by-stage elimination of nuclear arsenals."

"The Dagomys conference is being held on the eve of the opening of the next round of Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space weapons on 19 June. Do such conferences offer anything to the participants in negotiations—not only in Geneva, but also in other disarmament forums?" I asked Yasusi Akasi, deputy UN secretary general for disarmament, this question.

"In addition to diplomats taking part in the talks, we also invited representatives of nongovernmental organizations and scientific centers to attend this conference," Y. Akasi said. "This created a special atmosphere at the meeting. It turned into a power house for ideas which could open new horizons in the disarmament process."

Charges of 'Obsolete' Arms Scrapping Rebutted

PM2106113589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Jun 89 Second Edition p 4

[Article comprising reader's letter and response by own correspondent P. Bogomolov carried as part of "Dialogue" feature: "On the Subject of Reciprocity Once Again"]

[Text] "I am in favor of keeping the powder dry, as the saying goes. But, if we announce a reduction in our armed forces, then we keep our promises, as has been repeatedly confirmed. How then is one to explain the enviable tenacity with which Western radio stations, citing certain Japanese sources, seek to belittle the significance of M.S. Gorbachev's Beijing initiative, casting doubt, in particular, on the withdrawal of 16 warships from our Pacific Fleet which he announced? They allege that these ships are nothing more than heaps of scrap metal long unfit for use...

"A. Korochkin, military serviceman, Vitebsk."

Your own correspondent, P. Bogomolov, was informed at the USSR Armed Forces General Staff that the speculation being hyped abroad regarding certain deceptions accompanying the Soviet initiatives to improve the situation in the Asia-Pacific region do not conform with reality. The ships involved are in no way fabricated. They have a wholly real existence. While they are not, of course, the latest in their classes, they have nevertheless hitherto been considered perfectly capable combat units of the Pacific Fleet.

Incidentally, the attempts by certain circles to discredit the USSR's disarmament initiatives by referring to obsolete combat equipment that we are cutting are nothing new. The aim of such insinuations is simple. First, these circles specifically include in the overall balance all armaments, even obsolete ones—as has been done repeatedly, for example, with respect to tanks—in a bid to convince the public of our Armed Forces' "manifold superiority." Then, when Moscow makes another move to reduce combat hardware, those same sources start claiming that we intend to destroy "junk," "lumber," and "scrap metal" as a blind. And to the accompaniment of these trumped-up charges against the USSR behind-the-scenes attempts are then most often made by those people to speed up modernization and build up their own armaments. The reciprocity of the disarmament process is thereby undermined, and this is extremely undesirable.

The Soviet side considers this duplicitous line of conduct, which imperils the future of detente, outmoded. Dialogue between the military-political groupings in the world should be conducted meaningfully, seriously, and honestly without attempts to infringe on states' legitimate interests or discredit their peace initiatives.

Ryzhkov Sends Greeting to 'Group-77' Countries

LD2106185689 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1715 GMT 21 Jun 89

[Text] Moscow, 21 Jun (TASS)—Nikolay Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, sent a message of greetings to the participants in the jubilee conference of the "Group-77" member countries which unites 127 developing states in Asia, Africa and Latin America. It started today in Caracas, the capital of Venezuela.

Over a quarter of a century of its existence, it notes in the message of greetings, the "Group-77" has made a weighty contribution to the consolidation of the actions of the developing countries in the sphere of international economic relations. However, in conditions of an absence of real progress in the cause of a cardinal improvement in world economic ties, so far there have not been tangible changes in alleviating the disastrous situation in the majority of developing countries.

The realities of mutual dependence, Nikolay Ryzhkov stressed, demand the multiplication of efforts to resolve the global problems of modern times on the paths of the universal dialogue and partnership of all countries, the demilitarization and de-ideologization of interstate relations. The United Nations system in which the "Group-77" is pursuing an active and constructive line is called upon to play a special role in getting this cooperation going.

Six-Country Initiative Declaration Published

PM2206091389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Jun 89 Second Edition p 4

["Declaration To Mark the Fifth Anniversary of the Initiative of the Leaders of the Six States"—PRAVDA headline]

[Text] When the initiative of the six states was proposed in 1984, the international situation presented a gloomy picture.

Relations between the superpowers were characterized by mistrust, suspicion, and an absence of constructive dialogue. The arms race was continuing unchecked and very little was being done to reduce and ultimately remove the threat of nuclear war. Joint actions and incentives for peace were extremely necessary. The initiative of the six states arose from this belief.

We belong to different parts of the globe but are united by our common concern for the future of mankind. We endeavor to speak not only on behalf of our own peoples but also to voice the desire of millions of people from all continents and countries, including the citizens of states possessing nuclear weapons—in short, all who want to see the world free of the threat of war and free of the fear of nuclear destruction.

Important changes have taken place in the international situation in the 5 years which have passed since May 1984. Relations between the two superpowers have improved. Progress has been made in the task of arms limitations and disarmament. This gives us grounds for optimism. Probably for the first time since World War II, there is a real possibility for a radical departure from the confrontationist policies of the past. The events of the last 2 years have shown that, given the political will, no obstacle is insurmountable.

At our meeting in Stockholm last year we welcomed the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles as the first step on the way to nuclear disarmament. We also welcomed the political pledge of the Soviet Union and the United States to reduce their strategic nuclear arms by 50 percent. We urgently ask them not only to maintain the momentum in the progress toward disarmament but also to give it extra impetus to speed up the process. We urge them to complete negotiations on reducing strategic arms as soon as possible.

As participants in the six-state initiative, we have also emphasized that there is still a great deal to be done before we can confidently say that the disarmament process is irreversible. We gain satisfaction from the fact that one of our original aims has been achieved—the creation of a more favorable climate in international relations. Other problems remain, however:

The conclusion of a comprehensive treaty to ban nuclear tests, which would be observed by all states, is now a more urgent task than ever before;

Nuclear warheads from dismantled weapons systems must not be used in other weapons systems;

A multilateral disarmament verification system must be created within the UN framework as soon as possible;

An international agreement must be concluded to ban all use of nuclear weapons under any circumstances;

The threat of chemical war must be removed by concluding a convention on chemical weapons as soon as possible;

We must prevent outer space from being turned into an arena for the arms race and military confrontation;

Nuclear weapons must be reduced and eliminated within a strictly established timeframe.

Throughout the 5 years which have passed since we proposed our initiative, we have found the support given us by governments and parliaments, scientific circles, academic establishments, and popular, nongovernmental organizations all over the world a source of constant inspiration.

In the final analysis, disarmament is not a question of levels and conventions, warheads and launch facilities, or even treaties and resolutions. It is a question of people and the present squandering of human and material resources on mass destruction weapons. Vast masses of people suffer from poverty and hunger, disease and unemployment. These questions are too urgent to be ignored.

The dialogue we called for 5 years ago has been given a good start. The climate of mistrust has gone. Essentially, we are now witnessing a fresh search for ways leading to general security, which was the aim of our initiative.

This search for ways leading to security is giving rise to enormous problems and, at the same time, enormous possibilities for the future. And all six of us are ready to continue working together and also together with everyone else in the United Nations and at other international forums in order to achieve the finest aim of all—to guarantee the world a safe, peaceful future.

Gorbachev Reply Handed to Envoys

PM2206092589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Jun 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Message Presented"]

[Text] On 20 June A.A. Bessmertnykh, USSR first deputy foreign minister, received Indian Ambassador T.N. Kaul, Swedish Ambassador O. Berner, Argentine Ambassador F. Saturnino Bravo, Greek Ambassador I. Gounaris, Tanzanian Ambassador W.L. Mbago, and Mexican Charge d'Affaires ad interim in the Soviet Union F.H. Ismael Marcos to present a message from M.S. Gorbachev, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, to the leaders of Argentina, Greece, India, Mexico, Tanzania, and Sweden on the fifth anniversary of the initiative of "the six" for peace and disarmament, which was in response to an appeal from "the six" on 23 May 1989.

Presenting the official text of the message, A.A. Bessmertnykh said that the Soviet Union has always closely followed the activities of the "group of six" since its very first address. The priorities of "the six" largely coincide with our approach to resolving the tasks of building a nuclear-free, nonviolent world.

Receiving the text of the message, Indian Ambassador T.N. Kaul expressed gratitude on behalf of the states represented by the ambassadors for the Soviet side's high appraisal of the initiative of "the six," which represent four continents of our planet, and declared their willingness to jointly seek ways leading to general security and the guarantee of a peaceful future for all states.

18th Congress of Socialist International Opens

Brutents, Veber Leave for Sweden

PM2106075589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Jun 89 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "To the Socialist International Congress"]

[Text] K.N. Brutents, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee and first deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee International Department, and A.B. Veber, consultant to the department, left Moscow for Stockholm 18 June. They will participate as observers for the CPSU in the 18th Congress of the Socialist International at the invitation of its leadership.

Brutents, Brandt Hold Talks

LD1906130189 Moscow TASS in English 1245 GMT 19 Jun 89

[Text] Stockholm June 19 TASS—Soviet Communist Party officials, led by Karen Brutents, candidate member of the party Central Committee and first deputy head of the Central Committee's International Department, in the Swedish capital to attend the 18th Congress of the Socialist International, had a meeting with Socialist International President Willy Brandt.

The congress opens on June 20, and is to end on June 22.

CPSU Message to Congress

PM2106104589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Jun 89 Second Edition p 1

["Message From CPSU Central Committee to 18th Socialist International Congress"—PRAVDA headline]

[Text] To the 18th Socialist International Congress:

On behalf of Soviet Communists, the CPSU Central Committee sends greetings to the 18th Socialist International Congress and wishes it success in its work.

Today, on the threshold of the 21st century, mankind looks to the future with hope but also with concern.

The world has changed and continues to change—not least thanks to the age-old struggle of the working people for their social rights and the popular masses' increasingly broad intervention in politics. But it is also beset by new, unprecedented problems, which have become global problems. For the first time in history there is a real possibility of mankind destroying itself.

The consequences of the scientific and technical revolution which pose a threat to life on earth are forcing us to discuss new criteria of progress. Genuine progress is possible only in the conditions of a peaceful order. It must be universal or it will not exist at all. Search for a common human consensus is necessary in this respect.

The desire to reinterpret the world situation has led us to new political thinking. It is an inalienable part of the ideology and practice of restructuring. Delegates to the 18th Socialist International Congress are already aware that the USSR Congress of People's Deputies has confirmed and given legal backing to those principles of the Soviet Union's foreign policy course which stem from the new thinking. We have chosen this course forever and have no intention of changing it. We will consistently strive for the demilitarization, democratization, and humanization of international relations.

In recent years the Soviet Union has made unprecedented efforts to stop the arms race, particularly the nuclear arms race, and effect a move toward universal, verifiable disarmament. We have embarked on major unilateral measures. We have begun making substantial cuts in our arms and armed forces. The radical conversion of military production has begun. We are making significant cuts in our defense budget.

Our peace initiatives and unilateral practical actions have contributed to a qualitative change in the very atmosphere of international relations. A real reduction in Soviet and U.S. nuclear arsenals has begun. For the first time a mechanism to verify disarmament has been created and is operating effectively.

We attach great significance to the effective contribution of the Socialist International and its parties to overcoming difficulties—objective difficulties, but often also artificially created difficulties—in the way of reducing arms and strengthening international stability.

In East-West relations it is particularly important to avoid anything that could lead to the destabilization of these relations. In our opinion, the interests of peace and stability in Europe and the rest of the world would be helped by a policy based not on the desire to impinge on one another's security interests but on a desire to move relations between NATO and the Warsaw Pact into a nonconfrontational mode.

We propose a specific program of action for virtually the entire range of international problems: disarmament, the democratization of international relations, the settlement of regional conflicts, environmental protection, and the use of resources now squandered on the arms race to improve life for people, particularly in "Third World" countries.

We are aware that the Socialist International also has a fundamental program for these problems. We have many points in common. This was shown, in particular, by the discussions in the context of the celebration of the 70th anniversary of the October Revolution. The Moscow meeting demonstrated how our communication and collaboration can and must be built—not by any side "relinquishing its positions" but by jointly seeking answers to the challenges of the time, while ensuring that every trend and every party maintains its independence and its individuality.

Of course, there is still a great deal to be done in order to develop a modern concept of socialism that accords with the progress of civilization at the end of the 20th century. One thing is clear. Democratic rights and freedoms, from our point of view, are an integral part of socialist values. We want and can confirm that socialism and democracy, socialism and freedom are not antipodes. On the contrary, they belong to one another and fertilize one another. As the initiator of restructuring, the CPSU considers it to be its duty to the Soviet people and to all democratic, progressive forces in the world to ensure that it is crowned with success.

With friendly greetings,
[Signed] The CPSU Central Committee

Bloc Countries To Attend Council of Europe

PM1606083589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 Jun 89 Second Edition p 7

[TASS report: "Positive Move"]

[Text] Paris, 9 Jun—The Soviet Union, Hungary, Poland, and Yugoslavia have become the first countries to receive the status of "special invitees" to the Council of Europe—the consultative political organization of the 23 West European states.

"Special invitee" status grants the recipient countries the opportunity to send representatives of their parliaments with the right of a consultative vote to plenary sessions of the Council of Europe assembly and sessions of those of its working commissions to which they are invited.

'Repercussions' on European Ties, Visa Issues

LD2106132789 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 20 Jun 89

["Repercussions" program presented by Vadim Zubkov, with Nikolay Nikolayevich Afanasyevskiy, chief of the First European Department of the USSR Foreign Ministry; Nikolay Fedorovich Chervov, chief of a directorate of the Soviet Armed Forces General Staff; Karen Karovich Karagezyan, sector head of the CPSU Central Committee Ideological Department; and Rudolf Alekseyevich Kuznetsov, head of the Visas and Registration Department of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs—live]

[Excerpts] [Zubkov] Good evening, comrades. We are beginning our live program, Repercussions, devoted to European problems. We await your questions, and in the

meantime the telephone number you can call is 217-45-43. While you are gathering your thoughts and preparing to phone in—there is only one telephone number but it has over 10 lines—I will acquaint you with the contents of the program and its participants.

The subject for discussion is European problems and the new political thinking both from the West and the East, from our side. At the Congress of People's Deputies, Comrade Gorbachev said in his report that participation in the construction of a common European home is a very important area for our foreign policy activity.

Political life in Europe has been marked by many important events. These are, primarily: Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's recently ended visit to the FRG and his forthcoming visit to France, the talks in Vienna on conventional armed forces, and the conference on humanitarian issues in Paris. The participants in the program will reply to your questions and discuss all of these problems. Allow me to introduce them to you:

Nikolay Nikolayevich Afanasyevskiy, chief of the First European Department of the USSR Foreign Ministry. Please ask him questions about European political problems. Nikolay Fedorovich Chervov, chief of a directorate of the Armed Forces General Staff. Naturally, Nikolay Fedorovich will reply to questions on military themes. Karen Karovich Karagezyan, head of a sector of the ideological department of the CPSU Central Committee. This sector is engaged with humanitarian problems. By the way, Karen Karovich, just like Rudolf Alekseyevich Kuznetsov, is a participant in the first of the three European conferences—the conference on the human dimension, as that conference is officially called. The first is now taking place in Paris. The second will take place next year in Copenhagen. A year later the third will take place in Moscow. There is discussion of human rights and various aspects of European humanitarian cooperation. So, address questions on these to both comrades Karagezyan and Rudolf Alekseyevich Kuznetsov, head of the Visas and Registration Department of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs. This directorate handles questions of exit visas and permissions and now also passport problems within the country.

Let us start on the replies. The first questions began coming in to us as soon as the broadcast was announced. Nikolay Nikolayevich, a number of callers ask: Why are Comrade Gorbachev's visits to the FRG and France immediately following each other? Is the closeness of the trips just a coincidence or is it our preference for those countries in European affairs?

[Afanasyevskiy] That is a delicate question and particularly for those countries.

[Zubkov] But, you know our viewers increasingly want not just to be informed but to think increasingly acutely.

[Afanasyevskiy] As you know, international meetings are a reciprocal matter and their dates are determined by mutual convenience and mutual agreement. They depend on the calenders in each country. You know in our country there are sessions of the Supreme Soviet. There have been elections in West European countries.

I would look at things more broadly, perhaps. If one looks at the past few months, in April Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev was in Great Britain. At the end of last year there was a summit meeting in Italy. Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov had meetings with a number of leaders of West European countries when he made a brief visit to Luxembourg. On the whole, it seems to me that this is no coincidence and that there is a logic because now we are going through a period of great enhancement in our European policy and this is a practical illustration of what you were saying at the start of the program and what Mikhail Sergeyevich spoke of at the congress, about the importance we give to our European policy.

[Zubkov] Nikolay Fedorovich, viewers note that we often criticize Western states for being slow to reply to our initiatives in the disarmament sphere. And now they are asking: Are we not being tardy now in replying to the proposal President Bush made in Brussels at the recent NATO anniversary session which marked the 40th anniversary of the North Atlantic pact or alliance. But, probably, is is necessary first of all to recall the essence of the proposals made by the U.S. President. Would you please do that?

[Chervov] Well, insofar as we criticize the Western countries for being late in replying to our proposals, that is quite just. That really is the case. Now, as far as the proposals U.S. President Bush made are concerned, the political leadership has already given him an assessment—that this is a step in the right direction. The USSR has long called on the United States to respond to our proposals in the sense of reducing U.S. troops and armaments. The U.S. proposal has constructive elements. In particular there is the agreement to reduce in general all destabilizing armaments and also the number of troops, just as the Warsaw Pact countries propose. Moreover...

[Zubkov interrupting] And specifically, not only say tanks, armored vehicles, they have agreed on?

[Chervov] Yes. Moreover, they are proposing to reduce aircraft and also the number of troops. But this is a completely different content taking shape here. I will touch on this question later. But in principle, in reply to your second question as to why we are being tardy with our reply, we are not being tardy.

[Zubkov] It is not my question, it was a viewer who asked.

[Chervov] Yes, yes, yes. The point is that President Bush's proposal is still too general and the Brussels declaration points out directly that the NATO countries should complete the elaboration of the U.S. proposal and put it forward for examination at the talks at the beginning of September 1989. In order to reply to that question it is necessary for it to be submitted and it has not yet been submitted by the U.S. side and the Western countries. They are only promising to submit it at the beginning of September. Therefore, we are not at all being tardy. And if we take the opinions of NATO's military bodies, in particular the military committee, the committee for military planning and the Eurogroup, they note directly that as yet the U.S. proposal is of a general nature, that it needs further elaboration and to be made more specific. Time is needed for it to be submitted at the negotiations as the NATO countries' platform.

Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev spoke about what we are doing in this area during his visit to the FRG. He told Chancellor Kohl that at present we are fundamentally studying these proposals even though they are general in character and that soon they will be examined at a meeting—and this is very important—at a meeting of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee.

[Zubkov] Many thanks. Karen Karovich, it is no secret that for a long time questions of humanitarian cooperation were a stumbling block for us. But now there is a conference on humanitarian cooperation every year. This year in Paris, then there will be one in Copenhagen and then in Moscow. The question is being asked: Why are there three conferences all at once? What is it all about?

[Karagezyan] First, it must be said that a real breakthrough has indeed been made in the humanitarian sphere in my view. And it is quite clear that this is connected with restructuring which the party began with the April plenum and with the development of democracy and glasnost. Well, you may recall that at the 27th congress, humanitarian problems were included as an integral part of our concept of an all-embracing system of security. When the question of a state based on law was posed, it became evident that it was necessary to resolve humanitarian problems, problems connected with human rights. And all of this was connected with our cooperation with foreign countries.

But what did this cooperation look like? Well, on 1 August 1975 the Helsinki Final Act was signed. While the Final Act was being prepared and for years later the theme of human rights, the humanitarian theme, was the subject of a brawl, to put it crudely, between us and the West, between the socialist countries and the West. And on the whole, this lasted until the Vienna meeting within the framework of the Helsinki process took place. This tone partly remained in Vienna at the start. And when on the first day of the work of the Vienna meeting USSR Foreign Minister Eduard Amvrosyevich Shevardnadze put forward the proposal to hold a humanitarian conference in Moscow, it was regarded with great skepticism.

In the process of our restructuring, which influenced the whole diplomatic conference and also in the struggle at the Vienna meeting to turn-around from a confrontational approach to a constructive and businesslike approach. When we showed substantively, so to say, that not everything was in order with human rights in our country, and with the facts in our hands we showed that in other countries, too, far from everything was in order, it gradually led to our real beginning in talking about this in a businesslike tone. And in the end the proposal for the Moscow conference was accepted but in an altered form. France declared its desire to host a conference. Denmark stated its desire to hold a conference. And as I understand it, we willingly supported this because this gave us the opportunity to fundamentally and in a businesslike and unhurried manner and without fuss, tackle these problems. Therefore, holding three conferences is a good thing in my opinion.

[Zubkov] Thank you. Rudolf Alekseyevich, there is already a large package of questions for you. That is quite natural. As well as general questions, people would like to ask you very specific things. I will hand them to you in a moment. And, I think that everyone will be interested in this question. Our viewers have heard that in Bulgaria all citizens have the opportunity to receive a permanent foreign passport. The viewers are interested to hear whether the Soviet people will get the same opportunity. I hand you this question together with some others.

[Kuznetsov] Thank you. I think the viewers know that it is not only in Bulgaria that this question of keeping foreign passports and of going to various countries on passports which can be used over and over again is being decided. A similar procedure has been established in Hungary, and in the Polish People's Republic too.

At the present time we are also studying the possibility of Soviet citizens' going abroad and keeping passports with long validity for multiple trips. Because of a number of technical problems, in the first instance I think that we will decide questions connected with trips to socialist countries. And later, when the other questions are solved, then gradually, of course, citizens will have passports for trips to other countries.

[Zubkov] Many thanks. If it is not difficult, perhaps you could reply to some of the specific questions which are coming in for you now. While you are getting ready... Nikolay Nikolayevich, I have already handed you a few questions.

[Afanasyevskiy] Yes, there are a whole series of questions about the future of Europe and the European home. Comrade Sergeyev from Karaganda asks how one is to understand the policy of up to the Urals or further. What

is the view of European politicians and of ours. There are many questions about the place of the socialist countries in the common European home. Is the common European home not a fantasy? Is the structure taking on any specific shape? How do our Western partners regard this idea?

Some time ago, in the framework of this program, we spoke about this and if we said at that time that, of course, this is not a fantasy I wish to say that in recent months there has been a mass of evidence that this idea is becoming more than some sort of hypothesis or abstraction and is now a working idea. I think that a confirmation of this, a diplomatic confirmation but a very eloquent one is that in the joint declaration signed during Mikhail Sergeyevich's visit to the FRG, an important article, an important place is taken up by precisely the article on the readiness of both sides to work to seek ways leading to the creation of a Europe of peace and cooperation, a European peace structure, a common European home. And in replying to the question of up to the Urals or further, this same document, I think, makes it clear that there is room for the United States of America and Canada. Of course, the USSR—we also use Urals as a standard term which came about from the start of the European process from the Atlantic to the Urals—we will participate and we are participating in this whole process with our whole country, with all our potential, so I think that there is no need to regard this in a very formal or inflexible way.

I think that now, especially after Mikhail Sergeyevich's visit to the FRG, when we can say definitely that the last pages are being closed in Europe's postwar period, what is beginning is precisely the period of multilateral efforts, common efforts by the whole of Europe to construct what we call the common European home and what the FRG calls the European peace structure, what France calls Europe's solid future, what the Netherlands call the European family, and so on. We are beginning the construction of a long-term, firm period of peace in Europe. That is how I would reply to those questions.

[Zubkov] Many thanks. You know, I have several questions about—you cannot get away without questions about the Berlin Wall. Comrade Smelninov asks whether it is possible for the Berlin Wall to be demolished, and when.

[Afanasyevskiy] You know, the Berlin Wall, particularly in acute periods, has always taken on the nature of a symbol perhaps greater than the practical role which it fulfills. It is a frontier like any other. Moreover, in recent years it has become more penetrable than in the past. The wall appeared in a specific political situation. Its erection was completely legitimate and, of course, if conditions change, evidently the approach to this will change, too. As Mikhail Sergeyevich said when replying to a similar question in Bonn, there is nothing eternal under the moon.

[Zubkov] Many thanks. Rudolf Alekseyevich, you have very many questions. While you reply I shall hand over questions which are addressed to you, Nikolay Fedorovich.

[Kuznetsov] I have here both questions of a general nature and very specific ones. Svetlana Gennadiyevna Ivanova from Tashkent asks whether it is possible to leave the Soviet Union without a visa, without an invitation visa. I understand that she is asking whether it is possible to leave without an invitation for a temporary or a permanent stay. At present, the following procedure is in effect: One must present an invitation from any individual—either a relative or friends—for temporary trips to any country. In order to leave to take up permanent residence, as a rule an invitation from a close relative is required. I would like to note right away that at the moment a new act of legislation on issues concerning the departure and entry of Soviet citizens is being worked on which will affirm that temporary trips may be made without the presentation of an invitation. However, is must be borne in mind that an entry visa must be obtained from the country which one is entering in order to travel abroad, under the conditions established by those states. And if they refuse to issue a visa, then of course the trip may not take place.

Mikhail Zinovyevich Orlov, an engineer from the city of Kharkov: How long must someone who now has a second degree security clearance be away from his job in order to go abroad to take up permanent residence? My son lives in Canada and I would like to go and stay with him for 6 months or a year. Can this be done without a private invitation so that I can come back?

Replying to the second part first, I think that if you visit your son it will probably present no great difficulty for him to send you an invitation and for it to be registered according to the established procedure. As for the issue of citizens' knowledge of state secrets, this is a complicated matter. It is also being discussed a great deal at the moment. It is proposed that an act of legislation will provide that upon changing jobs a citizen must be advised whether he will be dealing with secret information. A specific period of time is being established. But if the citizen does not agree to this he has the right either to take up the position or to seek work which does not involve state secrets.

Is it true that there will be a common passport system among the CEMA member countries, asks Nikolay Nikolayevich Tishinskiy from the city of Tashkent. I understand that he is asking about a linked system for entry and exist and a common passport for traveling abroad. Indeed, these issues are being studied by the socialist countries and, of course, if a certain amount of agreement is reached this matter will be resolved. The USSR supports this trend.

Ostrovnaya asks—unfortunately she has not indicated which town she comes from: There used to be a law that when someone wanted to travel even on a tourist trip to a capitalist country they had to first have made a trip to a socialist country. Does this situation exist today?

Unfortunately, I have not heard that there was at some time a provision that one had to first make a trip to a socialist country and only after that to a capitalist country. Perhaps things were twisted in some way by the administration of the enterprise or organization. But I can say that there are no preliminary conditions for traveling abroad either to a socialist country or a capitalist country.

Valeriy Vladimirovich Ivanov from the city of Moscow asks: Why is there a 2-month period for the registration of documents at the department of visas and registration of foreigners? And why has the amount of money to be exchanged been halved, from R400 to R200?

On the first question, I would like to apologize in advance to television viewers because, according to the legislation in effect, the scrutinization period for temporary trips has been established at 1 month. Unfortunately, there are a number of circumstances including the solution of technical matters as well as the fact that the number of people applying to travel for temporary stays has increased sharply. In 1987, for example, 1.8 million Soviet and foreign citizens made trips in either direction, that is, six times more than in 1986. And, according to the information which we have, the number of applicants is at present growing sharply. But we are taking all the measures needed so that the period established by our legislation is observed.

On the question about the exchange of funds, unfortunately I can only affirm, as they say, that yes, it is true that a procedure has now been established that R200 is exchanged once a year for the capitalist and developing countries and up to R500 for the socialist CEMA member countries. But, Valeriy Vladimirovich, I think you can put this question specifically in writing to the Ministry of Finance.

Valeriy Ivanovich Dolgiy asks: During what period can documents be registered for a private invitation to the United States? I think everything will be clear from the reply I gave to the previous comrade.

Mukhtar Aliyevich Aliyev asks: Will the passport system be abrogated? And if so, when? And will there be free travel abroad? And likewise, when?

As I understand it, the question is about the passport system. Here, on the territory of the Soviet Union, this is related to travel around the territory of the USSR, entry into border zones, and so on. These issues are being considered at present and I believe that at some time in the near future certain decisions will be adopted. As for free travel abroad, I was also saying that it is envisioned that in the future, after the adoption of the new law, temporary trips will take place without invitations and travel to take up permanent residence will be on the invitation of any individual. But unfortunately, or, as they say, to our satisfaction perhaps, this will be an act of legislation, a law. At present, it is up to our deputies. It depends on how quickly they consider this document and adopt a direct decision.

[Zubkov] Incidentally, Rudolf Alekseyevich, look, please. [sentence as heard] Let's now allow Karen Karovich to speak. There are many questions about how work is progressing on preparing the legislative documents on various aspects of humanitarian activity in our future law-based state. And it is being asked specifically who is preparing these documents. Please continue on this topic.

[Karagezyan] Well, this is, precisely, a transitional period, from one Supreme Soviet to the Congress of People's Deputies and to another Supreme Soviet. Therefore, all this is changing. In the past version, laws and other documents were prepared first by the Supreme Soviet Presidium. That means that, as a rule, specialists in these matters drew up some kind of draft, a commission was set up, comprising representatives of all the departments affected one way or another by that law; and the law passed through all kinds of discussion. And some—only some, a few, as you know—laws were then put out for nationwide discussion.

Now that procedure will change obviously and sharply. Laws will go to the Congress of People's Deputies and the new Supreme Soviet. You know that committees and standing commissions of the chambers have been set up. I think that the first word will belong to the Committee on Issues of Legislation, Legality and Law and Order. As for humanitarian issues, the Committee on Issues of Glasnost, Rights and Appeals of Citizens will definitely also be involved. And I am convinced that the Committee on International Affairs will also have its weighty word regarding international humanitarian cooperation. I feel that the procedure will change fairly seriously now. [passage omitted]

[Zubkov] Nikolay Fedorovich, you already have a large group of questions. PLease be so kind...

[Chervov] Partially...

[Zubkov, interrupting] Excuse me, please. There is a question which is not relevant to the program, but which is important. Comrade Lodinin from Moscow asks whether sessions of the Supreme Soviet will be broadcast. This has already been reported: Yes, they will be broadcast. Go ahead.

[Chervov] Comrade Belyakova, Svetlana Valerianovna, from the city of Kharkov, asks about the fate of Soviet prisoners of war in Afghanistan.

The Soviet Government is undertaking every measure to free our prisoners of war, and we have around 300 men there. Now, what specifically is being undertaken? First, a lot of work is being conducted through diplomatic channels, through the foreign minister and the Red

Cross. This question is constantly raised at top-level meetings. A lot of work is being done by Yuliy Mikhaylovich Vorontsov, Soviet ambassador to Afghanistan, with Pakistan, Iran and other adjacent countries where our prisoners of war are being held. In addition, the so-called Hope organization has now been set up. It is also doing a lot of work in this area. In particular, several, a small group, a proportion of the parents of those prisoners of war have now gone to Pakistan to meet with the mujahidin, to try to resolve the fate of our prisoners of war. In other words, we...the Soviet Government is fully conducting a lot of work to release our people from captivity.

Comrade Lobov, Vyacheslav Gerasimovich, from the city of Moscow, asks whether the question of withdrawing our troops from the Warsaw Treaty countries will be examined, even in the long term.

Well, I must say that we are already withdrawing our troops from the territory of allied countries. You know that in connection with the reduction of our armed forces by 500,000, we are withdrawing our troops from the GDR, Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia and Mongolia. To date, we have already withdrawn from the Groups of Forces three divisions, three tank divisions, out of six: in particular, two divisions from the Group of Soviet forces in Germany and one division from the Southern Group of Forces. The remaining three divisions, three tank divisions, will be withdrawn next year. All these divisions being withdrawn are now being disbanded. Assault landing and assault river-crossing units are being withdrawn with their arms and military equipment, as well as the tank units of motor rifle and tank divisions which are now remaining there and being transferred to a defensive structure.

I can give you figures. To date, we have withdrawn from the Groups of Forces over 16,000 personnel, 2,600 tanks, around 3,000 vehicles and a large quantity of other weapons and equipment. From the Mongolian People's Republic we have withdrawn over 4,700 men, 350 tanks, 40 combat aircraft, and so on.

As for the prospects, you know that the Soviet Union announced to the whole world that we are prepared, on a mutual basis, to bring our troops back within our national frontiers.

Comrade Fedorova, Galina Ananiyevna from the city of Kharkov, asks whether regulations will be introduced whereby each officer will serve for 10 years after college, and after 10 years by agreement. This matter is not yet being examined.

Comrade Sheryavkina, Zinaida Vasilyevna, from the city of Volgograd, asks whether a reduction in the length of a soldier's service is envisaged. This matter is not yet being examined.

Comrade Vasilyev, Aleksandr Leontyevich, from the city of Moscow, asks whether, if our weapons are reduced by more than one-half, that will weaken our country's defense capability, and from which countries the greatest danger of attack is perceived.

Well, it has to be said like this. We envisage deep cuts, cuts in armed forces on a mutual basis. As for the danger of war, it has today been moved aside, but it has not been removed in principle. You see, there still exist groupings of armed forces in Europe numbering 3 million. We are not saying that the NATO countries will attack us now, but the potential and possibility does exist. It is contained in the groupings themselves. Therefore, while reducing ur armed forces by 500,000 now, we are at the same time putting forward proposals at the Vienna negotiations on deep cuts in armed forces, in order to deprive both alliances, the Warsaw Pact and NATO, of offensive possibilities, in order for them to have military potential capable only of defending themselves. In other words, we are dealing on a mutual basis.

Comrade Protkov, Nikolay Vasilyevich, from the town of Bobrov, Voronezh Oblast, asks whether a nuclear war on European territory is realistic now and whether we have overdone things with armed forces in Europe.

Well, I must tell you that nuclear war—any kind, a limited one, any sort of war—in Europe is suicide, and not only nuclear war, but also war using conventional strike weapons. In the first place, in Europe there is an enormous number of chemical enterprises, about 200 nuclear power stations and a large number of nuclear and chemical arms dumps, and calculations show that a war using conventional weapons alone could turn Europe into ruins within 20 days. It doesn't need any kind of nuclear war. It is sufficient to cite or refer to the example of Chernobyl to be convinced that that is definitely the case. Therefore, when groupings of armed forces numbering 3 million are confronting each other in Europe, military potentials must be reduced before it is too late, and reduced to a level necessary for defense alone.

[Zubkov] Thank you, Nikolay Fedorovich. Perhaps we can give...

[Chervov—interrupting] There is one more question. I'll say it stright out. The thing is, Comrade Grigoryev, Sergey Aleksandrovich, addresses it to you, Georgiy Aleksandrovich—I mean, Georgiy Ivanovich—and to me: Please tell the truth, from the position of our time, about the incident at the Borovitskaya Gate [in the Kremlin], during which Cosmonaut Nikolayev was injured. I will say frankly that I do not know about that incident.

[Zubkov] I haven't heard about it either.

[Chervov] And I cannot answer it. [passage omitted]

[Zubkov] Thank you for your answers. Nikolay Nikolayevich, you already have, I think, a number of interesting questions on European political problems. Go ahead.

[Afanasyevskiy] I have a number of questions connected with Mikhail Sergeyevich's recent visit to the Federal Republic of Germany and some sharp turnabouts, I would say, in this regard. Comrade Drozdov from Minsk asks what effect Gorbachev's visit to the FRG will have on our mutual relations with the GDR.

Well, I don't know what Comrade Drozdov has in mind, directly. I see no grounds for doubting that our traditional, strong relations of solidarity with the German Democratic Republic have been affected in any way by this visit. It is exactly the other way round, I think, the other way round. The fact that on the eve of the visit to the FRG, Comrade Shevardnadze, our foreign minister, visited Berlin and briefed the GDR leadershp on the main contents of the proposed portfolio for the conversations is evidence of a high degree of solidarity and trust. It was also valued highly by our comrades in the GDR. Yesterday, or the day before yesterday, there was a meeting between Comrade Honecker and the mayor of West Berlin. They adopted a special statement in which they welcomed the results of the visit and consider it an important event, both for Europe and for each country individually.

Comrade Mayorova, from Leningrad, an engineer, asks whether it isn't time to stop foreign trips and deal with state policy, or else many accidents, explosions, and collapses, and so on, will happen in our country.

Well, let me tell you frankly that I see no connection in these matters. In my opinion, much has been written about the very sad events which are indeed happening in this country, and they have been analyzed. That's a different matter. But I think that it is probably impossible, seriously, for such a country as ours—or any country, indeed—in the contemporary world somehow to isolate itself and not to conduct affairs with the outside world.

What do affairs with the outside world and foreign policy mean? First and foremost, today they mean of course contacts between leaders. Dealing with these matters every day and observing things, I can say that we regret that there are 24 hours in a day and 365 days in a year, and that our leaders—our ministers and our representatives—are so occupied by internal matters. We have accumulated a great many debts in past years. Leaders and representatives of many countries are coming to us, but our leaders are often not in a position for months or years to respond to these gestures. Visits and foreign trips are, principally, a sign of attentiveness and respect. They are also important stages in the development of the peaceful relations which we are now building with the outside world.

Comrade Gusev has not written his first name, his patronymic, or his place of residence. I don't know whether he is afraid of the consequences. He asks who pays for Raisa Maksimovna Gorbacheva to travel abroad? [passage omitted] We pay for the journey, and the reception is provided, as a rule, by the receiving side. So, I think that this needs to be viewed here from another angle: What enormous work in showing our country's new face is done by our representatives and our leaders particularly Raisa Maksimovna? At least, observing the reaction during visits to West European countries and other countries, I can assure Comrade Gusev that the expenditures which are incurred by Aeroflot or anyone else in the given case is recouped a hundred-fold. [passage omitted]

[Zubkov] Every USSR citizen knows our internal Soviet passport. Sometime, not later probably than mid-July, there will be a small inset put into it for exit to socialist countries with which the USSR allows trips to on a non-visa basis. This inset has the minimum number of questions: surname, name and patronymic, surname and name, [as heard] date of birth, what country you are visting, the aim of visit—in other words the information which is needed to properly monitor order at the state border. [passage omitted]

[Zubkov] Previously, in our approaches to understanding human rights there were substantial differences from those assessments by the Western world. We put the right to work and other forms of social security at the top of the list. There are a number of questions: Have our approaches changed? Have they come any nearer to the approaches of the United States and Western Europe?

[Karagezyan] Indeed, before what happened was that when, say, we signed the Helsinki Final Act, we evidently thought to ourselves that the question of political personal civil rights would somehow lie in the shade, while we concentrated on social and economic rights and, to put it crudely, chased the West into a corner on this line. However, I have already tried to explain that pproach has indeed fundamentally changed, and to put it briefly, the USSR and the socialist countries, the Western powers and the neutral states have come to the general conclusion that there is a unversality of human rights, i.e. that we must work together to observe those right, just as on disarmament, on the unity of those rights, on the unity of both social, economic and personal political rights,and so forth.

So there has been a change here and this allows us, I feel, at the Paris conference to strive for a very interesting new atmosphere. Criticism remains, but it is no longer criticism in terms of who will hurt whom, but business-like criticism and all countries are having not only to ask questions, but also to answer them. It is not turning out as some Western politicians calculated that in Paris they would institute court procedings against the socialist

countries. There were attempts, but in general nothing has come of them. They had occasion to ask questions but also to reply to questions. So there have been changes here. [passage omitted]

[Karagezyan] Comrade Nugmanov, Shavkat, a war veteran and pensioner, asks: All the papers and magazines print the slogan, Proletarians of all countries unite. Proceeding from today's conditions and the calls for the creation of an all-European peaceful home, is this slogan not an anachronism? Wouldn't it be better to replace it with a new slogan, for example: Peoples of all countries, fight for peace? My reply would be: If the matter concerns certain publications and newsletters for purely departmental use which print the slogan, I think it is long since time to remove it. Second, in our current work to renovate socialism there are immense tasks facing the social scientists, and I think it is for them to consider the content and form of this slogan. Today, I think that it does not run counter to the slogan put forward by Comrade Nugmanov. If, say, the workers in all countries unite in the fight for peace, then this will not only not do any harm, but we shall all gain from it.

A question from Comrade Nikolskiy, Vladimir Anatoliyevich, from Moscow, a doctor: What is the attitude of the mass media in the West to the platform of the Pamyat Society? Well, the question is put too broadly, so it is hard to give an unambiguous answer. The West differs. There are various media including those which will speculate on anything you like, and there are various aspects and opinions. If the question concerns people who take as their goal the struggle to preserve national monuments of culture and the arts, the newspapers in the West which write objectively have the same attitude as we do—a positive one. However, if the question concerns people adhering to extreme views in the sense that they preach national dissension, and contempt for other nations and peoples, then they have a negative attitude.

Please name the date when all human rights in our union will be brought into line with the human rights convention signed by the USSR, Comrade Atraskevich asks. Evidently he has in mind the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights because in total there are now about 22 conventions and agreements on human rights. So, the objective has been set of bringing all our domestic legislation into line with the international law documents and acts which we have signed. It is not possible to say precisely when this will be complete, although on a number of things specific deadlines have simply been set. However, the task is being posed, and in parallel with turning the USSR into a fully-fledged socialist law-governed state, I think it will be resolved.

[Zubkov] I would like to say that there is a certain deadline. This is the next all-European conference to be held in Helsinki in (?1993), where in general countries will have to render an account of all the work done in connection with fulfilling the provisions of the final document of the Vienna meeting.

[Karagezyan] I think we will have to render account even earlier, by one year, at the Moscow conference. But not because anyone is threatening us that if you don't do something or other, then we shall...

[Zubkov, interrupting] Nevertheless, these lines have been written, I am (?disciplining you, let's say).

[Karagezyan] I stand corrected.

[Zubkov] Thank you.

[Karagezyan] Another question: When Gorbachev and Kohl met, did they tackle the question of free emigration from the Soviet Union to the FRG by people of German nationality? As far as I know, there was no need to tackle this issue because, to begin with, the Soviet Germans, as they are called, or Soviet citizens of German nationality, have long had the opportunity to emigrate at will. True, this was previously connected with difficulties, evidently, because the figures were, so to speak, something else. But here I have the figures for exit to the FRG for last year—I don't have any breakdown, I cannot assert that all of these are people of German nationality, but without doubt a condsiderable proportion are. I can say that outright. And so, 33,846 requests to emigrate to the FRG were examined last year, and of this total, 33,204 requests were granted, or 99.2 per cent. Well, comparisons are always needed, and this was 3.3 times the figure for 1987. So, that's all I have for you for now.

[Kuznetsov] I would like to add something to what has been said for last year. I can quote that over 5 months of this year, over 33,000 requests for exit to the FRG—this means adults and children—have already been granted, 2.3 times more than in the same period of last year, and it is virtually up to the level of the whole of last year. [passage omitted]

[Zubkov] We are getting the repeated question that many Muscovites are pointing out the constant crowd at the U.S. Embassy, and also at the U.S. Consulate that we have in Moscow, and they ask what the cause is. And there are other questions. Carry on, please.

[Kuznetsov] I have another similar question here.

[Zubkov] Well, evidently it is a matter that people notice this and would like to have a detailed explanation.

[Kuznetsov] Indeed. Viewers probably know that for many years the West has constantly raised the issue that the Soviet Union supposedly does not allow citizens out permanently, that quotas have been set, and so on. Following the adoption of the relevant resolutions, developing democratization and glasnost, including tackling humanitarian problems, the opportunities for

Soviet citizens to exit to live abroad permanently have expanded considerably. And in this situation, a very interesting situation has arisen. For the month of February alone,—our U.S. colleagues themselves say this—more than 20,000 people were at the U.S. Embassy for conversations or interviews. I would like to note one nuance. When I cited this figure in Paris, the head of the U.S. delegation corrected me, and said that at the moment there are 26,000 at the U.S. Embassy. Naturally the situation is in itself a serious one, especially concerning those citizens who are exiting the Soviet Union for permanent residence abroad. In accordance with Soviet legislation, people have left their jobs, sold many of their things, their children here have left school, those studying at educational establishments have left the educational establishments. I could even quote an example which I quoted in Paris as well. A certain memo is issued to U.S. consular departments on which they write the number in line. I think that the viewers seeing me can confirm this. And I have seen on one of them that a person who applied in January was only advised to make a telephone call in January 1990, and then his case might be settled. Naturally, this arouses certain anxiety among us, and I know that the Foreign Ministry is looking into this, but we are devoting attention to it as well. [passage omitted]

The majority of questions I have looked through here concern the provisions of the new legislation. In just a short time, I would like to say what provisions we expect in the new legislation, all the more since I took part in preparing this draft. So, first, the passport will last for 5 years, valid for all countries in the world. As I have already said, no invitation will be required for temporary trips abroad on private business. In addition, temporary trips on private business will also be permitted if connected with professional work. Here of course the timeframe has to be not for a few months, but longer. We will also be tackling legislatively the issue connected with relationships between children remaining here and parents. We intend to resolve this issue in legislation, and there should be only obligations of maintenance. If the two parties fail to find a mutual solution, these matters will be examined by the court. At the same time, the questions connected with knowledge of state secrets that I have already spoken about are being tackled. [passage omitted]

[Chervov] Comrad Colonel Kruglikov asks us to report briefly the results of Admiral Crowe's visit to the USSR. It is an interesting question, I think. [passage omitted] He will personally give us his impression and evaluation of this visit tomorrow at the press conference.

In what form is the SDI program continuing in the United States and how are our leaders replying to this? There are several questions here on SDI. Regrettably, I have to say that the current U.S. Administration is still adhering to the SDI program. Research work is being carried out and it has already come close to the point where going any further is already on the verge of violating the ABM [Anti-Ballistic Missile] Treaty. Well, naturally, research work is also being carried out in the USSR, in the context of laboratory work, and as for how specifically we react at the talks, the problem is that we have linked reductions in strategic offensive weapons and the strict observance of the ABM Treaty in the form in which it was signed in 1972. This treaty, as it happens, sets the limit for what is allowed and what is banned, and whatever the case, this treaty bans tests of weapons in space, it bans putting weapons into space, and this is our standpoint at the talks on nuclear and space weapons which began with the new administration on 19 June. [passage omitted]

Comrade Akimov Sergey Nikolayevich, Moscow, an engineer: Universal military service was adopted in 1939 in connection with the real threat of war. Why do we have military service now, when there is no threat of war? I think the army should be staffed more by professional soldiers. Dear comrades, I can tell you my personal opinion, and make a comparison with the U.S. Armed Forces. The professional army in the United States pays approximately R80 billion in wages alone, while our total defense expenditures are R77.3 billion. Morevoer, a soldier receives $600-800 [per month] in his first year of service. I have been to the United States myself, talked to soldiers, and asked how much they get. And according to the contract they get $600-800 in the first year of service. Junior officers get $1,800. Can we maintain such an expensive professional army? Evidently, this is not realistic, comrades.

[Zubkov] Very interesting answers, but do think of the time, please.

[Chervov] Is our military leadership thinking about greater reductions than those planned for the armed forces in our country? Yes, it is thinking about them, but to begin with we must reduce what we have decided on, by 500,000 men. This is an immense problem, comrades. It is a social problem, a political-economic problem, a very complicated problem. By 1 January 1991 we have to resolve this task. In addition, in the future we will undoubtedly... [changes thought] at the Vienna talks we have put forward proposals for further reductions in our armed forces on a mutual basis.

[Zubkov] We thank you and go over to Nikolay Nikolayevich. Excuse me, but I have to remind you again, time is short.

[Afanasyevskiy] I have many questions on the specific situation in one or another country, that I physically simply cannot reply to. I can only refer you to the relevant magazines and newspapers, comrades, which it seems to me now write much more than previously, and quite fully, about what is going on in the socialist countries. And here I have questions about the situation in Sweden, in Norway, several questions on China, the events in China. Why is there no glasnost in covering events in China, asks Comrade Smirnov, in paricular,

from Rostov-on-Don, and several others. The rest I can't make out, maybe the telephonist didn't understand. Many countries are asking for the student demonstrations to be stopped. Why does our country for some reason think this is China's internal affair, and is this right?

Of course it's right. Of course it's China's internal affair. You can express oyour attitude to it somehow, but of course this has been, is, and remains China's internal affair. We regret what has happened, and chiefly we are of course concerned about the fate of the transformations, the reforms which have begun in that country. Our press is writing a lot about this at the moment, by the way, and I don't have the impression at all that there is no glasnost in covering events in China.

The same thing concerning the results of elections in Poland. Just today the government started giving detailed information, or I am certain that it will be giving it in the next few days. The results are not an easy matter for the parties of the government coalition. They are no easy matter. And as for how matters will go further, it is not completely clear how the opposition is behaving and will behave, having in general gained an overwhelming majority of seats in the Senate and quite a number of seats in the Sejm. But how developments go further there, we shall see.

An interesting question, one of principle, I think: During the visit to the FRG our side confirmed that we will continue supplying gas and oil to West Europe. Doesn't this contradict what was said at the Congress of People's Deputies about the unacceptability of such a policy in the future? Comrades, we cannot live without foreign trade, and unfortunately indeed we do trade in energy sources. At all times, when they were beginning the reform programs, the programs for transformations and modernization, of course efforts have been directed toward encouraging exports, and exports of high technology first and foremost, and so on. I think we will have to do a lot of work on this, and without it, of course, our idea of a common European home could end up without a solid foundation. [passage omitted]

And the last question dealing with policy. Comrade Vladimir Aleksandrovich Nadubov from Moscow, asks: Is it not because we take into account the opinion of all states, large and small, and deal with everybody, that we are having more success, but without our country—dot, dot, dot [as heard]? Perhaps I am ready to agree with Comrade Nadubov.

[Zubkov] Well, excuse me for asking you last, and very little time is left for you—2 minutes. But be so kind as to tell us about the most interesting quesiton.

[Karagezyan] Yes, it is difficult, but perhaps the questions concerning ideological work. Comrade Kozeronskiy from Moscow asks: Why in the period of restructuring have questions of ideology and counterpropaganda ended up in total neglect? Even now, in all textbooks, directives, and instructions, the West is portrayed as enemy number one, although the international atmosphere has warmed considerably. What new concepts have been developed on this question? Well, total neglect is your definition, but I would like to say that I partially agree with you.

In preparing for this program I leafed through one collection dated 1989, and there I found some formulations which seemed so archaic to me that I was simply shocked. Perhaps it is because we are too slow in printing our books, but the concept—I was trying to speak about this—is the concept of the new thinking. And the final question: Why for the 5th year now is no ideological work being carried out here in Moscow in party organizations, and a large number of people are leaving the party because of this? Well, I think that people leave the party not for this reason, but for the most varied of reasons, both opponents of restructuring are leaving and those who, maybe cannot keep in step. But this is not always a bad thing, if the people leaving the party are those who do not feel their ties are with the party. [passage omitted]

United States & Canada

Adm Crowe Meets With Gorbachev, Ends USSR Visit

Crowe, Gorbachev Cited Before Talks

LD2206001989 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 21 Jun 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpt] In the Kremlin today Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev received Admiral William Crowe, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the U.S. Armed Forces, who is in the Soviet Union on an official visit. [video shows Crowe, Gorbachev, and entourages standing] Before the conversation began, Admiral Crowe answered journalists' questions, and said in particular:

[Begin recording] [Crowe in English with superimposed Russian translation] I have familiarized myself with all types of your Armed Forces. I have visited five hero cities. I conversed not only with the military, but also with ordinary people. I have come to the conclusion that they are the same kind of people as we Americans. They highly value family happiness and domestic comforts. They want a bright future for their children and peace for their country. They are very devoted to their homeland. All of this delights the American people.

Perhaps in my mind I understood all of this before, but all the same it was very important to me to carry out this visit—to be convinced about everything with my own eyes. I am leaving your country with a feeling of profound respect for Soviet servicemen, men, and women. I have seen them in various places and in various situations. They are competent highly-qualified and disciplined people. I am taking back to my country the warmest of memories of them.

As a whole, Mr President, the visit passed off in superb fashion for all members of our delegation.

[Gorbachev] I think the fact that the head of the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the United States is carrying out a trip around the country...perhaps this is the most convincing argument in favor of the fact that our relations with the United States have already reached a new stage, and if one also takes into account those impressions which Admiral Crowe has shared—and I am very interested to hear this—then I think that this, too, is becoming a normal event and perhaps this trip by Admiral Crowe around the country and the visits to military units is an indication that we are moving away form regarding each other as opponents but rather as partners.

[Crowe in English with superimposed Russian translation] I congratulated him, and he said it was too early to congratulate him. [end recording] [passage omitted]

PRAVDA Reports Talks

PM2206104789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Jun 89 Second Edition p 1

[Text] In the Kremlin 21 June Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev received Admiral Crowe, chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, who is in the Soviet Union on an official visit.

William Crowe told Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev of his visits to Soviet military establishments and of his meetings with servicemen of the Soviet Army and Navy and highly assessed the field combat and naval combat proficiency, the discipline and sharpness of bearing and appearance of the personnel of units and ships.

In Moscow, Murmansk, Leningrad, Minsk, Volgograd, Tashkent, Samarkand and Sochi, Admiral Crowe and the generals, admirals, and officers accompanying him visited places connected with the memory of the heroism and selflessness of the Soviet people in the years of the Great Patriotic War.

From their numerous conversations, the U.S. representatives came away, according to them, with the conviction that the Soviet people are seeking peace and friendly relations with the American people.

The admiral told Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev of the commitment of the U.S. Administration and of U.S. President George Bush to personally reach an agreement on reducing nuclear and conventional armaments. The U.S. military leaders, in maintaining relations with the leadership of the USSR Defense Ministry, are acting in the same direction, he said.

Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev stressed the importance of systematic contacts between the military leaders of the two countries. This is making a contribution of no small importance to improving Soviet-U.S. relations. He noted the role in this of Admiral Crowe personally.

The Soviet leadership and the majority of our people are in favor of improving relations between the USSR and the United States, for respectfulness, and for equality and mutual consideration of national security, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev said.

In the statements of certain U.S. figures there still are recurrences of the "cold war," and the concept of nuclear deterrence is still noticeable. All this is a legacy of the past. One must free oneself of this when the world is emerging from the "cold war." The times require civilized relations and a strict respect for the freedom of choice of social and state systems by each people. Contradictions between states in our age can be solved only by peaceful, political means.

The prospects for talks on reducing strategic nuclear armaments and armed forces in Europe were discussed.

The conversation passed off in a frank, amicable atmosphere. Yazov, Moiseyev, Akhromeyev, Matlock, and Manas took part in it.

Crowe Speaks at News Conference

LD2106132889 Moscow TASS in English 1302 GMT 21 Jun 89

[Text] Moscow June 21 TASS—Admiral William Crowe, chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, described his Wednesday meeting with Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev as a good end to his trip to the Soviet Union. He was conducting a 10-day visit to the USSR at the invitation of General Mikhail Moiseyev, chief of the Soviet Armed Forces General Staff.

Speaking at a news conference in Moscow today, Crowe said he was pleased with the trip and praised the Soviet Armed Forces and the high skills of Soviet soldiers.

During his stay in the USSR he visited the missile cruiser Kirov and a nuclear submarine. He had also been taken to a strategic missile launch pad and saw contemporary Soviet arms and military hardware.

Admiral Crowe spoke warmly of his meetings with the Soviet people. He said that the Soviet and American people were very much alike: They love their children and their homeland, and want to live in peace and prosperity. He said that Soviet and American armed forces were also very much alike, because they had confident and highly-skilled soldiers.

Moiseyev said that the visit had helped promote Soviet-American political dialogue. He emphasised the importance of the Moscow-signed Soviet-American agreement on the prevention of dangerous military activity.

"The more we talked with our American colleagues, the better we understood our positions which helped us discuss urgent military issues," General Moiseyev said.

Despite all the differences and arguments, the visit's main gain is that both sides have come to understand each other better, Admiral Crowe said in conclusion.

Crowe Flies Home 22 Jun

LD2206080489 Moscow TASS in English 0743 GMT 22 Jun 89

[Text] Moscow June 22 TASS—By TASS diplomatic correspondent:

Admiral William Crowe, chairman of the joint chiefs of staff of the U.S. Armed Forces, who paid an official visit to the USSR at the invitation of Army General Mikhail Moiseyev, left for home on Thursday.

He was seen off at the airport by General Moiseyev, other officials, as well as Jack Matlock, U.S. ambassador to the USSR.

Admiral Crowe said before his departure that he would remember for a long time this visit to the Soviet Union. He had met with Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev and had expressed his satisfaction over the visit.

During ten days Admiral Crowe had visited nine Soviet cities, had seen a number of military facilities, units, naval ships and military academies where he had been accorded a cordial welcome.

He pointed out that such contacts permitted military leaders to get a better idea of each other.

China

PRC Minister Cited on Foreign Economic Ties

PM2006093089 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 18 Jun 89 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Interference in Internal Affairs Condemned"]

[Text] Beijing, 17 Jun—The Chinese Government will continue the policy of reforms and actively expand foreign economic ties, Zheng Tuobin, PRC minister of foreign economic relations and trade, stated at a conference in Beijing. XINHUA reports that he noted that the disorders and counterrevolutionary rebellion did great political and economic damage to China and caused difficulties in the development of economic and trade links with the outside world. Now, he went on, order has been restored.

The governments of the developing countries and the majority of socialist countries showed understanding on the question of the elimination of the counterrevolutionary rebellion by the Chinese Government, and are prepared to continue to develop ties with our country in the economic sphere, Zheng Tuobin stressed. The majority of developed countries also do not want the events that occurred to affect the development of economic relations with China. However, certain governments and politicians, unwilling to recognize the actual state of affairs, but guided by rumors, show shortsightedness by declaring the cessation of aid and credit and the freezing of the transfer of technology to China. They are trying to put pressure on the PRC and interfering in its internal affairs.

Zheng Tuobin expressed the wish that certain politicians and governments would show farsightedness and return to the path of development of cooperation with China on a mutually beneficial basis. Only thus, he noted, will it be possible to promote the cause of world peace and progress, as well as one's own interests, the minister noted.

Eight Sentenced To Death for Beijing 'Revolt'

PM2006083789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Jun 89 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Situation in Beijing"]

[Text] Beijing, 18 Jun—The situation in the Chinese capital has been calm in recent days. As was reported earlier, public transport, party and state organs, consumer establishments, stores, markets, shops, hotels, bars, and leisure facilities are functioning normally.

This very morning numerous Beijing families headed for the parks—favorite leisure areas for the capital's inhabitants. The playgrounds and game rooms so beloved of Chinese children have started functioning here again after a certain interval.

The markets are busy. The range of food and household supplies is gradually increasing.

Armed details of servicemen are still on the city's major thoroughfares, intersections, and streets. Military patrols have not been removed from Beijing's central Tiananmen Square and around the central party and state establishments, diplomatic quarters, and places where foreign representatives live. Vehicles and documents are checked at nighttime.

Eight people who took an active part in the recent counterrevolutionary revolt in Beijing were sentenced to death here Saturday [17 June].

XINHUA reports that the sentence was passed by a Beijing people's court. All eight had been charged with setting fire to military transports, beating up officers and men of the Chinese People's Liberation Army, and looting military equipment.

The convicted persons include workers, peasants, and unemployed people.

Efforts To Restore Order Outlined

LD1906184889 Moscow TASS in English 1837 GMT 19 Jun 89

[Text] Beijing June 19 TASS—By TASS correspondent Marat Abulkhatin:

The situation in Beijing and other large cities in China where disturbances have taken place recently is coming back to normal. Every day the Chinese media broadcast reports about the situation in provinces. In Beijing, Army units, alongside patrolling streets, render assistance to the local authorities in cleaning streets and thoroughfares.

The main theme of news programmes of central television and national newspapers is the study of the speech by Deng Xiaoping of June 9, 1989. Meetings with such an agenda are held in central agencies and institutions of the country and in provinces. Television reported that on the initiative of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party, a meeting was held in the residence of the Chinese leadership. Prominent representatives of the democratic parties of China took part. Speakers expressed full support for Deng Xiaoping.

Similar meetings were held at the Academy of National Defence of the People's Liberation Army of China and in other military organisations.

Public security bodies continue the search for activists of the outlawed organisation "The Independent Association of Beijing Students". Several persons who are on the list of 21 activists announced earlier by the Beijing public security agency have already been arrested. Chairman of the student association of Beijing University Yang Tao, as well as Ma Shaofang have been placed in custody.

In the evening news programme on Monday, central television of the PRC reported that Chinese leaders Li Peng, Qiao Shi, Yao Yilin and others met with relatives of servicemen of the People's Libration Army of China who were killed when checking disturbances in Beijing. Yesterday such a meeting was held with the participation of PRC President Yang Shangkun.

Television reported that in Shanghai, deputy secretary of the city committee of the Chinese Communist Party, mayor of Shanghai Zhu Rongji held a conference with officials from the city committee of education and staffers of 55 higher educational establishments of the city. It was noted at the meeting that the situation in Shanghai has become normal and is developing positively. It was noted at the same time that the struggle is not yet over. Zhu Rongji also said that it is necessary to pool the efforts to restore order in the city and ensure that studies at higher educational establishments are resumed as soon as possible.

XINHUA news agency reported that the Foreign Economic Relations Committee of the city of Chengdu, Sichuan Province, made a call to all foreign entrepreneurs who have left the city during the recent events, to return to Chengdu. It is noted in the address that public order has been restored in the city, and that the services, stores, transport, factories and plants are functioning normally.

Northeast Asia

U.S. Delivery of Arms to South Korea Criticized

PM1606140389 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 15 Jun 89 First Edition p 3

[A. Golts "Military-Political Commentary": "Contrary to Reality"]

[Text] The other day the Pentagon informed the U.S. Congress of its intention to deliver large batches of weapons abroad. One of the first potential recipients of

the military hardware is South Korea. Seoul's Air Force will shortly receive 30 F-4 fighters and the equipment needed to service them. The size of the contract is $246 million. Some 500 surface-to-surface missiles costing $54 million will be sent to South Korea to arm these warplanes. Giving a briefing on the Pentagon's intentions, a spokesman for the military department gave an assurance that these shipments are "part and parcel of the efforts being made by the United States to ensure stability and economic progress in the Pacific basin, and will not influence the balance of power in that region."

Of course, one would very much like to know just how the warplanes and missiles will promote "economic progress." However, let us leave that brainteaser to the Pentagon spokesman's conscience. All the more so as it is possible to agree with his other claim. Indeed, the United States has shipped to its allies in the region combat hardware and weapons in such quantities, and holds so many weapons itself at its own bases in Asia, that three dozen aircraft really will not alter the current balance of power.

We should mention something else: the negative role played by U.S. military policy in this part of the world. Take the situation on the Korean Peninsula. I would remind you that it is unstable and tense. And it was no accident that serious attention was devoted to this problem during the Soviet-Chinese summit. The sides expressed the opinion that the strengthening of security would be promoted by organizing an inter-Korean dialogue and creating conditions for a normalization of U.S. and Japanese relations with the DPRK. It was stressed that this requires above all the demilitarization of the peninsula and the withdrawal of foreign armed forces from the south. But Washington immediately issued a statement that no changes in U.S. policy with respect to Korea are envisaged. As we can see, the statement was soon backed up by reports of new military shipments to Seoul.

It is not only in this case that Washington has demonstrated this approach of responding to political initiatives by building up arms. A squadron of Harrier vertical takeoff aircraft has just been transferred to the U.S. base at Iwakuni in Japan. The JAPAN TIMES points out that the deployment of new warplanes will increase the strength of the U.S. Marine units deployed in the Japanese islands. The offensive strength, we would note. After all, these warplanes are designed to provide air support for U.S. Armed Forces landing operations.

The buildup of military might is taking place in a situation where, as is clear from recently published figures on Soviet troop numbers in the east of the country, the United States and Japan already have considerable superiority in the Asia-Pacific region. It is happening when the Soviet Union, in an attempt to strengthen confidence and security among the region's states, has started cutting its grouping there by 200,000 servicemen.

Of course, the quite blatant U.S. buildup of joint military might—its own and its ally's—could also be put down to the sluggishness of the Pentagon bureaucratic machine, which operates on the basis of long-established plans and cannot keep up with a dynamically developing situation. However, more probably this machine is deliberately working without taking account of reality.

Origins of Postwar Japanese Reforms Viewed

18070314 Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No 24, 17-23 Jun 89 p 4

[Article by V. Tsvetov, political observer for central television and all-union radio: "Where Did They Begin in Japan"]

[Text] *Japan began its movement toward its current economic and scientific-technical heights when it found itself in the extremely serious postwar political and economic crisis. Where did this country begin: with economic or political reforms?*

A political observer from central television and all-union radio, V. Tsvetov, discusses this.

The postwar reforms were conducted in Japan by American occupation authorities. Although there existed in Washington the Far Eastern Commission consisting of representatives from 11 countries, including the USSR, and in Tokyo—the Union Council, which also included the USSR but the policy with respect to Japan was determined and implemented essentially by General D. MacArthur's staff alone. The Japanese parliament and the Japanese government essentially only red-stamped its directives.

Democratization of the Imperial Regime

On 11 October 1945 MacArthur's staff sent the Japanese government a directive which prescribed the first five large reforms developed by the staff—to grant the workers the right to join into trade unions, to democratize the education system, to eliminate absolutism, to give women equal rights, and to democratize the economy. At the end of 1945 Japan held last place in the world in terms of the growth rates of industrial production and it had barely reached 30 percent of its prewar level, but the occupation authorities decided to begin with political measures—granting democratic rights to workers and granting them freedom from totalitarian militaristic oppression.

In December 1945 the occupation authorities began the land reform and the separation of religion from the state. Then they began to purge state institutions and political organizations of people who had compromised themselves by devoted service to the militaristic regime. And only in April 1947 did D. MacArthur's staff actively engage in restructuring Japan's economic organism.

One should not think, however, that the staff of the American occupation forces was made a refuge for democrats who were sustained by the idea of a truly democratic Japan. It is simply that the United States, having defeated Japan with the help of the USSR, was afraid of its possibilities of acquiring an aggressive force again and correctly thought that the most reliable barrier against this was democratic transformations.

On 10 October 1945 the Communists came out of the jails. For the first time in its history the Communist Party of Japan became a legal organization. The Socialist Party of Japan appeared in November. In May of the following year there was a Cooperative-Democratic Party. Along with the Liberal and Progressive parties, whose precursors were the prewar party of the bourgeoisie, these associations made the country's political picture very colorful.

The political activity of the broad segments of the Japanese population was incited even more by the Japanese Constitution which was signed by D. MacArthur's staff. It established the "inalienable right of the citizens to elect public officials and impeach them," the freedom of thought and conscience, the freedom of assembly, speech, the press, and "all other forms of expression of opinions." And the main thing is that the constitution forbade Japan to wage war as a means of resolving international disputes.

The New Economy

In keeping with the land reform the state sold the peasants 80 percent of the arable land which they previously leased from land owners. The remaining 20 percent was retained for leasing. In order to lease the land the peasants made a commitment to pay an average of 20 percent of the value of the harvest. The amount of land that could be owned was limited to 3 hectares. The emancipated peasant family with its own allotment of land became the basis of Japanese agriculture.

The staff of the occupation forces eliminated 200,000 people from state, social, and political activity. It was not frightened by the panicky warnings that without experienced personnel there would be nobody to lead the country. The existence of opposition among the really experienced personnel seemed much more dangerous to the staff.

Before its defeat in the war a group of mighty conglomerates, "zaibatsu," were the bosses in the Japanese economy. As if with tentacles they ensnared the economy to their own immense advantage. Having grown up along with them, the bureaucratic apparatus subordinated state policy to the interests of the "zaibatsu." The "zaibatsu" passed foreign aggression off as the implementation of the great plans to transform Japan into the richest, happiest, and most advanced country. Elimination of the autocratic authority of the "zaibatsu" was therefore regarded as the main goal of the economic reform.

Results of Restructuring Japanese-Style

What did the reform produce in reality? Abolition of the monopolism of the producers. Enlivenment of market relations. Flourishing of competition. The appearance of possibilities of realizing one's own capabilities. And as a result: the release of the creative initiative of an immense mass of enterprising people.

The cold war and later McCarthyism slowed down and later halted the progress toward further democratization of Japan. The next stage in its postwar history was doomed to the "opposite course." The term describes precisely what was happening in Japan at that time. But the positive impetus to the country's development had already been provided.

The main impediment, inflation, was removed by the abolition of government subsidies for unprofitable productions. Instead of subsidies they were offered credit with the banks being responsible. A reasonable taxation system encouraged investment of capital in industry, construction, and scientific and technical development. A realistic exchange rate for the exchange of goods made it possible, on the one hand, to enlist foreign capital in Japan and, on the other, to activate Japanese export practice. A role was played by American aid and orders which Japanese industry filled for the U.S. Army which was fighting in Korea.

Of course the Japanese had to work. There was a period when it had to tighten its belt. But the spirit of creativity awakened by political and economic reforms, the persistent desire for success, and the confidence that success was possible enabled the Japanese to overcome their difficulties.

Six years after the surrender Japanese industrial production had reached the prewar level and the national income exceeded that level.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

SRV Defense Minister Arrives in USSR 21 Jun

LD2106172589 Moscow TASS in English 1700 GMT 21 Jun 89

[Text] Moscow June 21 TASS—By TASS diplomatic correspondent:

General of the Army Le Duc Anh, member of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Vietnam and Minister of national defence of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, today arrived in the Soviet Union for a six-day official friendly

visit at the invitation of General of the Army Dmitriy Yazov, alternate member of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee Politburo and USSR defence minister.

General Le Duc Anh was met at the airport by General Yazov and other officials. Nguyen Manh Kam, Vietnam's ambassador to the USSR, was among the welcoming party.

The defence ministers of the two countries had a meeting on the same day. They discussed some questions of Soviet-Vietnamese relations, the situation that formed in Southeast Asia in connection with partial withdrawal of Vietnamese troops from Kampuchea and other questions of mutual interest.

"I often visited the Soviet Union and I have always admired the hospitality of your people, its kindliness and sincerity", General Le Duc Anh said. The guest is of the opinion that his current planned visit will promote the further strengthening of bonds of friendship between the peoples of the two countries and their armed forces.

On the same day General Le Duc Anh placed a wreath at the Lenin Mausoleum. A wreath was also placed at the Unknown Soldier's Tomb at the Kremlin Wall.

General of the Army Yazov gave a dinner in honour of the Vietnamese military commander.

SRV Minister Cited on Troops Leaving Cambodia

LD1806111989 Moscow TASS in English 1112 GMT 18 Jun 89

[Text] Tokyo June 18 TASS—Vietnam will fully withdraw its contingent from Kampuchea before the end of September this year even if agreement on the establishment of a mechanism for international supervision over the troop withdrawal is not achieved by that time, Do Muoi, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, said in an interview with the KYODO TSUSHIN news agency in Hanoi. The interview was published on Sunday.

"Vietnam strives for a settlement of the Kampuchean problem as soon as possible so as to get an opportunity to concentrate efforts on its own rehabilitation," he emphasised.

The head of the Vietnamese Government rejected conjectures that Vietnam might allegedly suspend the withdrawal of its Armed Forces from Kampuchean territory if no accord on the establishment of a mechanism to supervise the troop withdrawal is reached at an international conference in Paris next month.

"I sincerely hope that such circumstances will not arise. But even if a political settlement is not achieved, Vietnamese servicemen will be fully withdrawn by the end of September", Do Muoi said.

"The Kampuchean people is strong enough and can tackle its problems independently".

The chairman of Vietnam's Council of Ministers pointed out that Western countries had made use of the presence of Vietnamese servicemen in Kampuchea as a pretext for pursuing a hostile policy with regard to Vietnam and for applying economic sanctions against it.

After Vietnamese troops leave Kampuchean territory, he said, Western countries and Japan will have no such pretext any longer.

Yazov Greets Cambodia's Tie Banh on Army Day

BK2006135389 Phnom Penh Domestic Service in Cambodian 1200 GMT 20 Jun 89

[Text] On the occasion of the 38th anniversary of the Kampuchean People's Armed Forces [KPAF] traditional day and the Army-People Solidarity Day, Comrade General Yazov, defense minister of the USSR, has sent a greetings message to Comrade General Tie Banh, defense minister of the State of Cambodia. The message noted:

Beloved comrade minister, on behalf of the USSR Armed Forces and in my own name, I would like to extend warm greetings to you and all Cambodian soldiers on this KPAF founding day.

Firmly resolved to further strengthen the bond of friendship and cooperation between the Soviet and Cambodian Armed Forces, all Soviet soldiers wish the entire Cambodian people success in implementing their policies, political solution, and national reconciliation.

May cadres and combatants of the KPAF achieve victories in fulfilling their tasks to ensure peace and progress for the Cambodian people.

With highest regards.

Pol Pot Resignation Termed 'Farcical'

18070310 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 13 Jun 89 p 3

[Article by Pavel Ulko: "Farcical Resignation"]

[Text] As became known in Bangkok, the capital of Thailand, the radio station of the Cambodian opposition had carried a "sensational" message to the world: Pol Pot had resigned the post of director of "the supreme institute of national defense." The resignation was accepted by the leaders of this group, Khieu Samphan and Ieng Sary, in early June.

How is this step to be viewed? This is the question which unwittingly comes to one's mind. Could it be that the ringleader of the "Khmer Rouge" is overcome by belated atonement for the 3 million victims of the murderous

regime he headed in the years 1975 through 1979? Or could it be that their ghosts rob the butcher of his sleep following the exile of the clique from the country?

I think it could hardly be so. Facts are a stubborn thing. As early as 1981 Pol Pot disbanded his so-called "communist party." Four years later, he gave up the title of supreme commander of the armed forces of "Khmer Rouge." However, in the process he has never lost the position of at least one of the most influential leaders of the group, if not the actual head of it. Therefore, the names of positions change little in this instance.

The radio broadcasts of "Khmer Rouge" confirm this. They report that Pol Pot intends to play "an active role in the anti-Vietnamese resistance" in the future as well. However, who do the followers of Pol Pot intend to "resist?" After all, before the end of September the entire Vietnamese volunteer military contingent will be withdrawn from the territory of Cambodia.

Most likely the fuss over the resignation of the ringleader of "Khmer Rouge" is nothing but an attempt by the followers of Pol Pot to change their guise, a tactical step aimed at making the group look more respectable. After all, an international conference on Cambodia is to be held in Paris in August. This is all there is to it.

However, hardly anybody in the world is going to be misled by the awkward maneuvers and the farce with resignations and reassignments. The essence of the Pol Pot regime of genocide is known to world public opinion. The court of history has already rendered its sentence. This is why an appeal for preventing its restoration under any guise is so current.

USSR To Consider ASEAN-Superpowers 'Hot Line'

BK1906065789 Kuala Lumpur BERNAMA in English 0621 GMT 19 Jun 89

[Text] Kuala Lumpur, June 19 (OANA-BERNAMA)—The Soviet Government has expressed its willingness to consider Prime Minister Dr Mahathir Mohamed's proposal for "a hot line" between ASEAN and the superpowers as their legitimate and constructive roles in the region will benefit all.

The head of the Directorate of Evaluation and Planning in the Soviet Foreign Ministry, Dr Vladimir Lukin, told a press conference at the end of the third Asia-Pacific roundtable here Sunday [18 June]: "The Soviet Government will seriously consider the proposal."

Mahathir proposed the hot line when he delivered the keynote address at the roundtable Saturday. He said ASEAN must be prepared for a comprehensive and creative engagement of the superpowers to prevent hegemonism by any quarter.

The head of the Institute of Oriental Studies of the Academy of Sciences in Moscow, Dr Gennadiy Chuffin, also praised the proposal and described it as "a viable one which will greatly contribute towards reducing conflict and building confidence in the Pacific region."

Presenting a working paper at the roundtable earlier, Chuffin said President Gorbachev's recent visit to China symbolised the end of three decades of animosity and effectively normalised Sino-Soviet relations.

He said the most significant characteristic on the new stage in Sino-Soviet relations is the acceptance of the universal concept of peaceful coexistence, mutual respect, and non-interference in each other's domestic affairs.

Near East & South Asia

Further Reportage on Visit by Hashemi-Rafsanjani

Declaration on Principles of Relations

LD2206143489 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1337 GMT 22 Jun 89

["Declaration on the Principles of Relations Between the USSR and Iran"—TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, 22 Jun (TASS)—A declaration on the principles of relations and friendly cooperation between the USSR and the Islamic Republic of Iran was circulated here today. It says:

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Islamic Republic of Iran, regarding their expanding ties in the aspect of their historical development, express satisfaction that the two countries' mutual relations have entered a new stage.

The emergence of the new political thinking in the Soviet Union on the one hand, and the victory of the Islamic revolution in Iran on the other hand, have created a basis for deeepening ties and good-neighborly cooperation, proceeding from respect for sovereignty, territorial integrity, equality, and mutually beneficial constructive cooperation in the interests of the two peoples with the purpose of establishing just relations between all peoples. In this aspect, the exchange of messages between Imam Khomeyni and the Soviet leadership became a manifestation of the sides' mutual will for developing and strengthening relations between the two countries.

Both sides are confident that cooperation between the two neighboring countries is developing in accordance with the principles and goals of the UN Charter toward strengthening peace and security in the region and the world.

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Islamic Republic of Iran, proceeding from their mutual interest in strengthening good-neighborliness and mutually beneficial cooperation, declare that they will be guided in their relations by the following principles and objectives:

1. Bilateral relations between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Islamic Republic of Iran will be built invariably on the basis of the aims and principles of the UN Charter, a rigorous observance of (their) equality, mutual respect for national sovereignty and territorial integrity, non- aggression, non-interference in each other's internal affairs, the non-use of force and the inadmissibility of the threat of its use in any circumstances, and the resolution of all problems by peaceful means.

2. The sides, bearing in mind that they are neighbors, will extend their all-around cooperation in various spheres, specifically in the ecomomic, trade, technical, and industrial sphere, and will also seek new forms and spheres for such cooperation, including the peaceful use of atomic energy. The Soviet side agrees to cooperate with the Iranian side with regard to strengthening its defense capability.

The two sides also agreed to extend, on a plan basis, (their) cooperation in the sphere of science, education, and links between universities.

3. The parties, in striving for a deeper knowledge of the spiritual values of each other's countries, will strive for a broader familiarization of the peoples of the Soviet Union and Iran with each other's life, culture, convictions, customs, and traditions of friendship. The parties will facilitate visits by delegations and the establishing of contacts between religious figures of the two countries.

4. The parties will exert all efforts to change the existing order in international economic relations on the basis of giving those relations a more just nature. They will cooperate with the aim of eliminating any discriminatory actions in the area of international economic relations, reducing the existing gap between North and South, and also not allowing the use of politically motivated levers of commercial and economic pressure, which are contrary to international norms.

5. The parties will deepen cooperation with the aim of strengthening the UN and enhancing its role, and also utilizing the UN's potential as an effective instrument for strengthening peace and international security and restructuring international relations, while confirming their adherence to the principles of respecting territorial integrity and the inviolability of internationally recognized borders, and striving to free the world from aggression and the threat of war in any form.

Acting within the framework of the principles of the UN charter and making use of the opportunities available to them in international organizations and in the world community of states, the two sides will cooperate with the aim of delivering the world from wars and military threat by means of prohibiting the use of the most destructive means of conducting war—that is nuclear, chemical, and other types of weapons for mass destruction—through their elimination.

(?The sides) [words indistinct] are firmly convinced that the cooperation which will be implemented on the basis of the provisions of the current declaration in the direction of strengthening international peace and security will be effective and constructive in character.

Moscow, 22 June 1989, which corresponds to 1 Tir 1368 [according to the Islamic calendar]
For the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
[Signed] M. Gorbachev
For the Islamic Republic of Iran
[Signed] 'Ali Akbar Hashemi-Rafsanjani

Talks Continue 21 Jun

PM22061119 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Jun 89 Second Edition p 1

[TASS report: "Talks Continue"]

[Text] In the Kremlin 21 June talks were continued between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and 'Ali Akbar Hashemi-Rafsanjani, speaker of the Iranian Majlis, who is in the USSR on an official visit.

Comrade Gorbachev noted that the intensive nature of the talks which are now in progress in Moscow is making it possible to find joint or identical approaches to many important questions and is creating a good basis to move Soviet-Iranian relations into a stage of active work. A good indication, he said, is the fact that both sides are moving on to specific and large-scale accords. These accords are revealing the prospects for a new stage of cooperation which is in the interest not just of our two peoples but also of the region and the world as a whole.

Hashemi-Rafsanjani agreed with this assessment. He supported the proposal by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev to listen to the respective ministers who are members of the two delegations on the results of the examination of specific proposals in accordance with the instruction which they were given by the two leaders at the former round of talks. The speakers from the Soviet side were Comrades Shevardnadze, Katushev, and Konarev. Their speeches stressed that a qualitatively new stage in relations had begun with the exchange of greetings between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Imam Ruhollah Musavi Khomeyni.

It was noted that the Soviet-Iranian talks were preceded by a great amount of preparatory work with the participation of various ministries and departments of the two countries. This year alone there have been four meetings between the foreign ministers of the USSR and Iran. As a result, a number of documents of a political, economic,

scientific, and technical nature have now been prepared. The main, final political document is the declaration of the principles of our mutual relations which brings to the fore the importance of the development of good-neighborliness and which also lays a solid foundation for the prospects for the further development of links between the two countries.

It was also reported that a long-term program has been definitively agreed on trade, economic, scientific, and technical cooperation between the USSR and Iran for the period to the year 2000. This important document determines the framework for active cooperation between the two countries in 15 sectors of the national economy, in the sphere of science and technology, finances, space, and the use of atomic energy. An agreement on trade exchange and also on the construction of a railway on the Mashhad-Serakhs-Tedzhen section has also been prepared for signing. Much work has been done to draw up an agreement on gas. Work on this agreement will be completed in the near future. Solid groundwork has been provided for cooperation in development of transport communications between the two countries.

The Soviet ministers expressed a number of specific proposals and ideas including some on questions which can be agreed only at summit level. One such question which was decided immediately during the meeting concerned the possibility of restoring direct passenger rail communication between Moscow and Tehran.

Reports were delivered from the Iranian side by Foreign Minister Velayati and by Iravani, minister of economic affairs and finances. They shared the opinion of their Soviet colleagues about the present status and prospects for joint work to develop bilateral cooperation in various spheres. In particular, from their side additional emphasis was given to the importance of cooperation in the sphere of power engineering, fisheries, and agriculture in which both sides are interested.

In response to the ministers' reports Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev said that the work which was done accords with the tasks which had been set and that now it is extremely important to transfer the accords which have been reached onto the plane of practical implementation more rapidly. What is necessary for this is more large-scale approaches and more improved organization of matters than was the case previously, and all the more so since many sectors and enterprises of the two countries would be put into action. It is important that Soviet-Iranian cooperation will serve the interests of our peoples, raising people's well-being and prosperity.

Hashemi-Rafsanjani expressed satisfaction at the productiveness of the talks being held and at the reception which he was being given in the USSR. I have been in the Moscow for only 24 hours, he said, but I already feel almost at home. He shared his impressions of his visit to the Zvezdnyy township and gave a high asessment of the space program being carried out by the USSR. He voiced the thought that perhaps the time has come closer when it would be worth thinking about carrying out a joint Soviet-Iranian space flight. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev proposed that the respective organizations of the USSR and Iran should work out the specifics of this question.

An in-depth discussion then took place on a number of regional and international problems, including an Iran-Iraq settlement and the Afghan problem and also on individual aspects of bilateral ties. At the conclusion of the conversation with a large number of participants Hashemi-Rafsanjani conveyed an invitation to Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev to pay a visit to Iran, stressing that the Iranian people, who know the Soviet leader well and respect him, are awaiting a meeting with him.

Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev expressed thanks for the invitation and noted that the more relations develop, the more the sides should exchange visits at the most varied levels.

Comrades Shevardnadze, Katushev, A.A. Bessmertnykh, N.S. Konarev; Yu.P. Grishin and V.F. Mordvinov, USSR deputy ministers of foreign economic relations; B.A. Omelichev, first deputy chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff; V.V. Gudev, USSR ambassador to Iran; and Yu.K. Alekseyev, chief of a USSR Foreign Ministry department were present. From the Iranian side there were Foreign Minister Velayati, Iravani, minister of economic affairs and finance, B. Nabavi, minister of heavy industries; M. Va'ezi, deputy foreign minister; Amrollahi, chairman of the nuclear power organization; and N. Heirani-Nobari, Iranian ambassador to the USSR.

Next there was a conversation with a small number of participants at which the foreign ministers of the two countries were present.

Gorbachev's 21 Jun Dinner Speech

PM2206115189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Jun 89 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "In a Friendly Atmosphere. Speech by M.S. Gorbachev"]

[Text]

Esteemed Mr. Hashemi-Rafsanjani,
Esteemed Iranian guests,

Comrades,
I welcome you here, in one of the most famous buildings of our ancient Kremlin.

Your arrival in the Soviet Union shows that progress is being made in Soviet-Iranian relations. And this cannot be otherwise, for we are neighbors, who, as Iranians say, live wall-to-wall.

True, there were periods in our past when our border was turned into a blank wall. It is good that these times are apparently gone.

To lose chances that are offered to us in our relations in the present-day situation would mean not to claim the legacy left to us by history. Incidentally, the Hall of Mirrors where we are meeting now witnessed communication between high representatives of Russia and Persia from the time it was built.

There have long been contacts and strong attractions between the cultures of the Russian people and other peoples of our country and of the Iranian people.

The USSR and Iran have the common frontier stretching for 2.5 thousand kilometers. This is not only a political but also an economic factor. It is so far little used to mutual benefit, the way good neighbors should, I must admit.

And this factor is also of great international importance. For if relations were established between all neighbors on all the continents, a fabric of good-neighborliness, a reliable protective net for the whole globe would be woven.

The interdependence, interrelationship of humanity was noted long ago by the great poet and humanist Saadi. Without taking into consideration this growing wholeness of the world no realistic policy is possible. Therefore the balancing of interests, in our opinion, is, undoubtedly, a reasonable principle of conducting international affairs, also settling conflicts.

In this light and for other understandable reasons both our countries are affected by the Afghan conflict most of all and in the most immediate way.

We, on our part, are doing everything possible so that the Afghan people should at last have peace and calm in its house and could decide its destiny in the framework of a neutral, nonaligned, and independent state by political means, through national reconciliation, and not through a fratricidal war.

If everybody strictly observed the Geneva Accords they signed and respected the resolution on Afghanistan unanimously adopted by the 43rd session of the United Nations General Assembly, this goal would have already been achieved.

We wish most sincerely success to the Iran-Iraq negotiating process on the basis of the U.N. Security Council resolution 598.

Mr. Hashemi-Rafsanjani, you are visiting our country in remarkable days. The first Congress of USSR People's Deputies has ended recently. The new USSR Supreme Soviet started working on a permament basis.

The congress has become a turning point in the history of the Soviet state, has brought to light huge nationwide potential of restructuring. It is a question of fully and thriftily realizing this potential.

Huge work, revolutionary for its importance and historic consequences has begun. We are now continuing this work with even greater vigor and confidence in our abilities.

The new Supreme Soviet is ready to develop interparliamentary ties with Iran on a regular basis. This would be a prestigious channel for expanding our peoples' knowledge of each other and for moving toward greater mutual understanding. It would be a good way to reveal specific areas for constructive cooperation and organizing collaboration.

We think that the exchange of opinions and talks over the past few days have been very useful. They have allowed us to broach the most important issues of the present and future of Soviet-Iranian relations and to expand mutual understanding in international affairs.

We hope to continue contacts at various levels, including summit level.

We wish you, Mr Hashemi-Rafsanjani, good health and successes; we wish the Iranian people peace, prosperity, and progress!

Hashemi-Rafsanjani Speaks

PM2206121789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Jun 89 Second Edition p 2

[TASS account of speech given by 'Ali Akbar Hashemi-Rafsanjani, speaker of the Iranian Majlis, at a 21 June Kremlin dinner given in his honor by M.S. Gorbachev under the general heading: "In a Friendly Atmosphere"]

[Text] Esteemed Mr Chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, our friendly neighboring country. From myself and on behalf of the people accompanying me I thank you for your warm words. One of perhaps the most favorable situations—unprecedented in the history of two states—in the history of Iranian-Soviet relations has arisen now. Previously Iran constantly attracted the attention of the great powers, which endeavored to enslave it and open the way to India. Our country was not regarded as an independent state with which equitable and friendly relations could be maintained.

After the Great October Socialist Revolution Russia did away with the colonial past and concluded an appropriate treaty. 'A.A. Hashemi-Rafsanjani then pointed out that Iran was for a long time, both under the domination of the Kajars and also under the Pahlavi dynasty, dependent on Western imperialism. Only the Islamic Revolution in Iran, carried out under the leadership of His

Holiness Imam Khomeyni, opened up a new phase in the country's history. For the first time in a century the Iranian people breathed the air of freedom, independence, and autonomy.

Unfortunately, the country's peaceful development was interrupted by the war unleashed by Iraq. The war and the situation that arose in connection with it impeded broad cooperation with all Iran's neighbors, primarily with our great northern neighbor—the Soviet Union—with which we share a long border and with which we are linked by numerous historical, cultural, and other factors of commonality. The complications linked with the Afghan problem added to this. A new foundation was needed to enable us to return once again to the common path that accords with the interests of both neighboring countries. We are grateful to Mr Gorbachev for having created such a favorable foundation by his enterprise and boldness, which are unparalleled in the history of world socialism.

To be frank, the Iranian leader continued, we did not think such a course of development possible since we saw the internal problems within socialist countries. However, Mr Gorbachev has undertaken to solve his own people's problems and has also set an example to countries friendly and allied to the Soviet Union. The course was set of reducing tension throughout the world and ensuring complete noninterference in neighboring countries' domestic affairs. This new thinking, which we can by rights record as a new revolution, has reinforced tranquillity in neighboring states. The Iranian leadership, which has constantly and sincerely wished to develop cooperation with its neighbor, has taken advantage of these opportunities and on Imam Khomeyni's initiative took steps to open a new chapter in the history of bilateral Soviet-Iranian relations.

Imam Khomeyni's historic message to M.S. Gorbachev constituted the point of departure for the new process. The Soviet leadership's benevolent reaction to this message paved the way for further steps and for the visit by an eminent Iranian delegation to the Soviet Union. Substantial and important results have been achieved during our stay here.

We saw that we share a common viewpoint on the overwhelming majority of international and regional problems and questions of bilateral relations. There is also a broad sphere for mutual cooperation and I can now say with satisfaction that, owing to the efforts we have made, an extensive list of agreed objects of cooperation has been compiled.

There is no doubt that the new process in Soviet-Iranian relations is playing an important role in both countries' development. The degree of consensus achieved is extremely significant. We hope that Iranian-Soviet cooperation will be an example for other neighboring countries which want to develop mutual ties and not experience unkind feelings toward one another.

We also hope that USSR-Iranian relations will serve to strengthen peace and security in the region and help eliminate the influence of expansionist imperialist forces there, which are endeavoring to establish supremacy over natural resources which belong to the peoples. [Rafsanjani ends]

The speeches by M.S. Gorbachev and 'A.A. Hashemi-Rafsanjani were greeted with applause

The dinner took place in a friendly atmosphere.

On the same day the guest visited Zvezdnyy Gorodok.

The Iranian leader laid a wreath on the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier at the Kremlin Wall.

Hashemi-Rafsanjani Addresses News Conference

LD2206083589 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0700 GMT 22 Jun 89

[Text] Moscow, 22 Jun (TASS)—New horizons have appeared in relations between the USSR and Iran, while during the process of the talks in Moscow it was found possible to attain almost all the goals that had been planned, stated 'Ali Akbar Hasemi-Rafsanjani, speaker of the Islamic Majlis, at a news conference held here today. Appraising his talks in the Kremlin with Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, he emphasized that (?both) sides succeeded in taking major steps in expanding their bilateral relations. Both the Iranian and the Soviet sides expressed satisfaction with the results of the talks.

Iran's policy in the sphere of defense, said 'Ali Akbar Hashemi-Rafsanjani further, is a policy that presupposes that self-sufficiency will be attained. If Iran defends and protects itself making use of its own potential, it will meet with success. The speaker of the Islamic Majlis noted that Iran is an independent producer of aircraft, missiles, electronic equipment, armored vehicles, and artillery hardware.

Speaking of the relations with the United States, 'Ali Akbar Hashemi-Rafsanjani stated that prior to the revolution the United States had pursued a policy of supremacy in Iran, insulting the Iranian people, while after the revolution it pursued a policy of interference and plots, blocked and froze Iranian assets in U.S. banks. The Americans themselves spoiled their relations with Iran, the speaker of the Islamic Majlis stressed.

Replying to a question about the attitude to Salman Rushdie, the British writer, he pointed out what the imam said: This is a Shari'a injunction and not the imam's personal view, and the entire Islamic world, certain differences notwithstanding, approved this injunction "which can not be lifted." "There is no one in Iran who can or would be in a position to lift it," he said.

Having touched on the problem of the Afghan settlement, 'Ali Akbar Hashemi-Rafsanjani said that this in its entirety a prerogative of the Afghan people and Iran has no right to interfere in is internal affairs. Iran, Pakistan, the PRC, the USSR should help Afghan people arrive independently at a decision on their country's destiny, he emphasized.

Replying to a question about what sort of Iran he would like to see on the threshold of the 21st century, the speaker of the Islamic Majlis said that the Iranian revolution was an Islamic cultural, economic, and political revolution. We want to turn Iran into a Muslim country with an independent culture, which is politically independent, self-sufficient, and democratic. From the economic viewpoint we want the country to attain self-sufficiency and not to depend on others. The necessary base does exist for this. From the viewpoint of foreign policy, the Iranian official stressed, we want to have good relations with all states, save for two or three countries whose regimes are illegal.

The Iranian oficial is leaving by air for Leningrad today.

Hashemi-Rafsanjani Visits 'Mir' Center

LD2106183689 Tehran Domestic Service in Persian 1630 GMT 21 Jun 89

[Text] Majlis Speaker Hashemi-Rafsanjani, visited the "Mir" research center and the Yuriy Gagarin Memorial in Moscow this morning. On the 2d day of his tour of the USSR the Majlis speaker also visited the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier and paid his respects by laying a wreath. According to an IRNA report, at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier the national anthems of both countries were played. following which Mr Hashemi-Rafsanjani inspected a march by special units.

The Majlis speaker then visited various parts of the "Mir" research center, including its training center as well as the tomb of the first Soviet cosmonaut, Yuri Gagarin, which is located 19 km northeast of Moscow. Three-time Soviet cosmonaut Vladimir Lakhov described his memories of his last trip. He was accompanied by an Afghan cosmonaut on his last trip. He mentioned that as a result of equipment failure, they were in a critical condition for 29 hours during which the Afghan member of the team recited Koranic verses. I believe that this, coupled with his faith, resulted in our returning to earth safely.

According to the same report, the second round of discussions between Hashemi-Rafsanjani and Mikhail Gorbachev will be held in the Kremlin tonight. Members of the Iranian delegation will also be attending a dinner given by Mr Gorbachev in honor of the Majlis Speaker.

Extends Visit to USSR

LD2106173189 Tehran Television Service in Persian 1700 GMT 21 Jun 89

[Report from Moscow]

[Text] I should inform you, dear viewers that, in view of the importance of the visit of Hashemi-Rafsanjani to the Soviet Union and the welcome accorded by the high-ranking officials of that country to the high-ranking political and economic delegation from our country, the speaker of the Islamic Consultative Assembly and the acting commander in chief of the Armed Forces has prolonged his visit to the Soviet Union by a few days. Previously it was planned that Hashemi-Rafsanjani's visit should come to an end on Thursday, tomorrow.

Gorbachev Bids Hashemi-Rafsanjani Farewell

LD2206071589 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0630 GMT 22 Jun 89

[Text] Moscow, 22 Jun (TASS)—Today 'Ali Akbar Hashemi-Rafsanjani, chairman of the Islamic Consultative Assembly and acting commander in chief of the Armed Forces of the Islamic Republic of Iran, who has completed the official part of his visit, is departing from Moscow for Leningrad. An official ceremony to see off the Iranian leader has just been held in St. George's Hall of the Great Kremlin Palace. Mikhail Gorbachev bade 'A.A. Hashemi-Rafsanjani farewell and wished him a good journey. The cortege of vehicles set off from the Kremlin for the airport, accompanied by an escort of honor of motor-cyclists.

'A.A. Hashemi-Rafsanjani is on an official visit to our country at the invitation of Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Guest Seen Off to Leningrad 22 Jun

LD2206084989 Moscow TASS in English 0804 GMT 22 Jun 89

[Text] Moscow June 22 TASS—Iranian parliament speaker 'Ali Akbar Hashemi-Rafsanjani left Moscow for Leningrad today at the close of the official part of his visit to the Soviet Union.

At the airport the Iranian leader was seen off by Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and minister of foreign affairs of the USSR, and Anatoliy Lukyanov, alternate member of the Politburo and first vice-president of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Hashemi-Rafsanjani is currently in the Soviet Union at the invitation of Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev.

USSR, Iranian Delegation Officials Meet

Shevardnadze, Velayati Meet

LD2106161989 Tehran IRNA in English 1550 GMT 21 Jun 89

[Text] Moscow, June 21, IRNA—Foreign Minister 'Ali Akbar Velayati held talks with his Soviet counterpart Eduard Shevardnadze Wednesday on mutual ties and reviewed economic cooperation accords to be signed by the two countries.

The two also agreed that understandings reached on bilateral consular affairs be included in a letter of understanding and inked by their deputies.

In order to deepen and diversify Tehran-Moscow ties, Velayati and Shevardnadze agreed that Iranian and Soviet experts study issues pertinent to cultural ties and exchange of professors and students.

Velayati is part of the delegation led by Majlis Speaker Hoj. Akbar Hashemi-Rafsanjani, the highest ranking Iranian official to visit the Soviet Union after the Islamic Revolution triumphed in 1979.

Silayev Meets Iranian Minister Nabavi

LD2206102489 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0944 GMT 22 Jun 89

[Text] Moscow, 22 Jun (TASS)—Ivan Silayev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, today received Behzad Nabavi, minister of heavy industries of the Islamic Republic of Iran, who is accompanying 'Ali Akbar Hashemi-Rafsanjani on his official visit to the USSR.

In the course of their conversation, issues of expanding cooperation between the Soviet Union and Iran in the sphere of machine-building, in the light of high-level accords [as received], were examined.

Commentary Views Hashemi-Rafsanjani's Visit

NC2106124989 Moscow in Persian to Iran 1100 GMT 20 Jun 89

[Andrey Krasnov commentary]

[Text] Dear listeners: The visit to the Soviet Union by 'Ali Akbar Hashemi-Rafsanjani, Majlis speaker and acting commander in chief of the Iranian Armed Forces begins today [20 June]. This visit and Hashemi-Rafsanjani's talks with the Soviet leaders can be an important step in improving relations between the Soviet Union and Iran. Our commentator, Andrey Krasnov writes:

The visit by Majlis Speaker Hashemi-Rafsanjani to Moscow is the continuation of recent Soviet-Iranian high-level contacts. The process of normalization of relations between the Soviet Union and Iran began early this year when Imam Khomeyni's special envoy came to our country to deliver the imam's private message to Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev.

With this step, the Iranian government paved the grounds for better understanding between the two countries. The future consolidation of cooperation between Moscow and Tehran is linked with Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze's visit to Iran in late February this year. Shevardnadze handed over Gorbachev's answer to the leader of Iran. He met and talked with Majlis speaker Hashemi-Rafsanjani and with Iranian Foreign Minister Velayati. Moreover, during his stay in Tehran, Shevardnadze held fruitful talks with Ayatollah 'Ali Khamene'i, who was recently appointed spiritual leader of the Iranian people. Both Khamene'i and Hashemi-Rafsanjani expressed their full support for mutually beneficial Soviet-Iranian cooperation during their talks with the Soviet foreign minister.

Specific constructive steps were also taken toward this effect. For example, the two sides signed the protocol of discussions that take regular exchanges of views through the two countries' foreign ministries into consideration. In addition, a program for cultural and sports exchanges between the Soviet Union and Iran for the 1989-90 period was signed.

It is not accidental that for the first time in recent years, Iran is to participate in the International Moscow Film Festival which is to open on 7 July this year.

The governments of both countries agree that close economic cooperation can and should form the basis for good-neighborly relations between the two countries. It is believed that perceptible changes toward improvement of Soviet-Iranian economic relations are to take place in the near future. For example, it has been foreseen that in 1989 economic relations between Moscow and Tehran will treble in comparison with the past year, and that trade between the two countries will exceed $1 billion.

At the same time, the immense potential strength that exists in the expansion of economic and technical cooperation between the Soviet Union and Iran should be utilized more fully. In fact, it should be recalled that the Iranian side expressed readiness to expand mutually beneficial relations with the Soviet Union.

On 28 May the Majlis ratified the agreement of cooperation between the two countries in the setting up of the Khoda Afarin and Qiz Qal'esi hydrotechnical installations on the Aras border river and for the joint utilization of these installations.

During Hashemi-Rafsanjani's visit to Moscow, new economic agreements of great dimension are expected to be signed by the two countries.

The Soviet Union has always deeply respected the national choice of the Iranian people, and understands their problems and calamities. This was once again proven during the sad days after the death of Imam Khomeyni, founder of the Islamic Republic of Iran when Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev sent a message of condolences to the Iranian leadership. Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and Anatoliy Lukyanov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Presidium of the Supreme Soviet, visited the Iranian Embassy in Moscow and signed the book of condolences. Meanwhile, the Soviet Government expressed hopes that Iran will continue Imam Khoemyni's policy on the fundamental improvement of relations with the Soviet Union.

Hashemi-Rafsanjani's visit to the Soviet Union is proof of the deepening dialogue between the two countries and it will help to strengthen the positive outcomes gained from former high-level meetings and talks between the Soviet Union and Iran.

It seems that one can now justly speak about an increase in the motivation of Soviet-Iranian relations—relations that are expanded with the spirit of true good-neighborliness and mutual respect.

The nature and outcome of the Soviet-Iranian talks show that agreement and understanding between the Soviet Union and Iran on big issues of mutual interest are expanding and deepening more and more. Soviet-Iranian relations have now entered a new phase and are being placed on a higher level. The visit to the Soviet Union by Iranian Majlis Speaker Hashemi-Rafsanjani should stabilize this process and move toward the consolidation of the bases of cooperation between the Soviet Union and Iran.

Najibullah Addresses Afghan Military Commanders

LD2206101989 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0907 GMT 22 Jun 89

[Text] Kabul, 22 Jun (TASS)—President Najibullah met commanders of the Armed Forces of the Republic of Afghanistan in the Afghan capital today. Our state, the Afghan leader said at the meeting, has embarked upon a stage which is crucial for its fate. The peaceful proposals put forward by the Afghan leadership are being rejected by the opposite side, which imposes an armed confrontation. In these conditions we have no choice but to defend our homeland, although we understand very well to what extent the Afghan people and the servicemen are tired of the war.

Our strength, the president continued, consists in the indissoluble unity of the party and Armed Forces. Our enemies' main efforts are directed at introducing a split and contradictions in our ranks. If we want to survive and win, we should not give them such an opportunity.

"The rebels and their foreign patrons—Najibullah noted—in their struggle against Afghanistan's legitimate government, are extensively using foreign mercenaries who today are directly participating in combat actions."

The president went on: "Islamabad is cherishing a plan to establish a military and political bloc in southwest Asia. This is precisely why Pakistani authorities are trying to bring the Afghan rebels to power by any means...the establishment of such a bloc would simplify the implementation of Islamabad's idea about annexing Afghanistan under the cover of the slogan of 'confederation,' would mean an infringement upon the right of the Pashtuns and Beluchi to self-determination, and would create grounds for implementing anti-Indian and anti-Soviet plans. It is becoming clear that both the 'jihad' and the formation of an 'Islamic government' in Afghanistan are for Pakistan nothing but a smokescreen behind which it is trying to form a military and political bloc."

It is obvious, Najibullah stressed in conclusion, that Pakistan's plans are creating a real threat not only for our country, but for peace and security in the region. The Afghan Armed Forces are capable of not only defending the homeland's independence, territorial integrity, and national sovereignty, but also of preventing the creation of such a bloc.

Pakistani Minister Receives USSR POW Group

LD2106173389 Moscow TASS in English 1702 GMT 21 Jun 89

[Text] Islamabad June 21 TASS—A delegation of the Soviet public staying in Pakistan was received by Pakistani Foreign Minister Yaqub Khan. The delegation consists of representatives of the people's and coordination Committees for the release of Soviet servicemen taken prisoner in Afghanistan. During the meeting the minister said that the Pakistan side will exert every effort so that the delegation could fulfil its mission successfuly. But he said the Pakistan side does not know what is the exact number of Soviet servicemen taken prisoner in Afghanistan and their whereabouts.

The members of the delegation among whom are parents of missing servicemen were warmly received by activists of the Pakistan-Soviet Friendship Society. The society's chairman Hanif Wahid wished the parents of missing soldiers success in their efforts to bring about the release of their sons and all other Soviet servicemen held by rebels.

Reports from Peshawar say that members of the delegation had a conversation today with Sebghatullah Mujaddedi, president of the "Transitional Government of Mujahids" of Afghanistan and leader of the "Afghanistan National Salvation Front."

Ambassador Discusses Fate of POWs in Afghanistan

PM1906141289 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
18 Jun 89 Morning Edition p 5

[Interview with USSR Foreign Ministry Special Ambassador N.I. Kozyrev by our correspondent M. Yusin: "Bringing the Motherland's Sons Home: What the USSR Foreign Ministry Is Doing To Rescue the Prisoners of War Who Fell Into the Hands of the Afghan Opposition"—date, place of interview not stated; first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] The IZVESTIYA editorial office is receiving hundreds of letters whose authors are worried about the fate of the Soviet soldiers taken captive by the Afghan opposition. Many readers want to know about the work being done to release the prisoners of war by Soviet departments and organizations, first and foremost the Foreign Ministry. At our correspondent's request, USSR Foreign Ministry Special Ambassador N.I. Kozyrev talks about Soviet diplomatic activity in this area.

[Kozyrev] The Foriegn Ministry began its active work to find and free soldiers and officers in the hands of the Afghan opposition long before glasnost made it possible to discuss the problem of Soviet prisoners of war widely. As long ago as 1982 our ministry made contact with the International Red Cross Committee, one of whose main functions is to help prisoners of war. Under an agreement reached between the USSR, Switzerland, and the Red Cross, a special reception center for servicemen taken captive in Afghanistan operated for some 3 years on Swiss territory. A total of 11 Soviet soldiers passed through this reception center. Eight of them returned home and three decided to stay in the West. In 1986 the Swiss reception center closed—one reason for this was the opposition's refusal to hand over prisoners of war through the International Red Cross.

Nonetheless the links between the Foreign Ministry and the Red Cross were not broken. At our request the International Red Cross Committee, through its representatives in Pakistan and Afghanistan, collects information on the fate of Soviet citizens in captivity. Unfortunately the results of these efforts are not yet great—the opposition has virtually barred access to Soviet prisoners.

We were also able to bring into cooperation politicians from third countries, who agreed to act as intermediaries in talks with irreconcilable opposition groupings based in Peshawar. In summer 1986 an accord was reached with W. Brandt, honorary chairman of the Social Democratic Party of Germany and chairman of the Socialist International, who promised to help make contact with one of the most radical opposition groupings—the "Islamic Party of Afghanistan," headed by G. Hekmatyar. In October of the same year indirect contacts began with the Islamic Party of Afghanistan. In March 1988 an unofficial meeting between Soviet representatives and members of the opposition took place in Bonn, with the participation of K.H. Rosen, chief of Brandt's personal office.

The next talks with the Hekmatyar group were organized in Tunis in August 1988—this time with the help of PLO leader Yasir 'Arafat, to whom we also appealed for help. Over a month, 'Arafat's personal representative Abu Khalid made several trips to Islamabad and Kabul, where he met with Mujahidin and Soviet officials. The result of this activity was the release of five of our soldiers who were in the hands of Hekmatyar's fighters.

We are constantly raising the subject of prisoners of war in talks with representatives of those countries that have some influence on the Mujahidin leaders—mainly Pakistan, Iran, and the United States. In the course of E.A. Shevardnadze's visit to Islamabad in February of this year, these problems were discussed with the Pakistani president and foreign minister. That country's authorities deny that there are Soviet servicemen on Pakistani territory. At the same time they expressed readiness to help in the search for the prisoners and their return home. During Comrade Shevardnadze's visit to Tehran and his talks with the Iranian leaders the question of prisoners of war was again touched on.

The Soviet side is seeking actively to make use of direct contacts with the opposition, too. The fate of the soldiers in the hands of the Mujahidin was at the center of attention during the talks held in Al-Ta'if, Islamabad, and Tehran with leaders of Afghan opposition parties by Yu.M. Vorontsov, first deputy foreign minister and USSR ambassador to Kabul. Soviet embassies abroad give substantial help. For instance, at the end of last year our diplomats in Islamabad, with the participation of the Pakistani administration, embarked on talks with the opposition on releasing the prisoners. These contacts continue to this day.

In its activity the Foreign Ministry is in close contact with numerous social organizations that, like us, seek to bring home the Motherland's sons who found themselves in trouble, and these include first and foremost the Coordinating Committee of the Soviet Public for the Release of Prisoners of War and the "Hope" people's committee. On 17 June members of the "Hope" committee, including parents of four prisoners of war, flew to Islamabad, where they will meet with representatives of the Afghan opposition and the Pakistani leadership. It must be noted that while the trip was in preparation the Pakistnai authorities showed understanding, and even agreed to organize a visit for the Soviet delegation to Peshawar—headquarters of the "Alliance of Seven." One hopes that the trip to Pakistan, which became possible thanks to the initiative and activeness of the "Hope" committee, will be successful and yield concrete results by clarifying the fate of even one soldier missing without trace and alleviating the suffering of even one Soviet family.

[Yusin] How many prisoners of war have been released by the opposition since the beginning of the conflict? How many people, according to your information, are still in captivity?

[Kozyrev] While the Soviet military contingent was in Afghanistan some 400 officers and men were put on the lists of missing without trace. Of that number, 86 people have been released and returned home. Information at our disposal enables us to assume that the greater part of the remaining 310 people are held by various opposition groupings in and outside Afghanistan. In addition several dozen Soviet servicemen, after being released, remained in the West.

[Yusin] Talking about the missing men, you gave a figure that has not previously been made public—400 men. Our official sources have hitherto cited different figures—313...

[Kozyrev] The figure of 400 servicemen missing without trace includes those who were released before the figures were first published.

[Yusin] On what terms have the Mujahidin agreed to release prisoners?

[Kozyrev] The majority of the 86 servicemen who returned home were released as a result of agreements that our military people, representatives of the limited contingent, concluded with commanders of opposition detachments on the spot. As a rule there was an exchange of prisoners. Naturally, the terms differed in each case. But obviously the exchange was not done on a "one for one" basis.

[Yusin] And how was it possible to achieve the release of the five men who fell into the hands of "extremist number one"—Hekmatyar? I am talking about the terms, again...

[Kozyrev] Those five soldiers returned to the USSR in December 1988. The talks, as I said, were difficult and long, and took place through intermediaries. Eventually, thanks to the Afghan Government's assistance, a solution was found. In exchange for the release of the Soviet prisoners of war from Afghan prisons, extremists who were captured in the course of combat operations were released. I cannot tell you the exact number. Although, of course, there were not five, but considerably more.

[Yusin] And have there been cases of the USSR paying a ransom for the return of prisoners of war from the opposition? I ask because the public is proposing to hold a nationwide collection of funds for the rescue of prisoners and ask us to agree to any price the Mujahidin ask, and if necessary to sacrifice part of the country's currency reserves.

[Kozyrev] Not one Soviet soldier who fell into the hands of the Afghan opposition has been ransomed as yet—the Mujahidin prefer to exchange them for their own prisoners of war.

[Yusin] There have been reports in foreign sources that the Soviet Union is paying for the release of prisoners with arms...

[Kozyrev] There have been no such cases.

[Yusin] One last question. You spoke of "several dozen" former prisoners of war who decided to stay in the West. Could you be more explicit—how many men, in which countries?

[Kozyrev] According to our information, something like 16 people have remained in the United States, about 10 in Canada, and a few in West European countries. Although it must be said that after USSR General Prosecutor A.Ya. Sukharev stated on 4 July last year that servicemen captured by the Afghan opposition will not be prosecuted, three former prisoners who had remained in the West changed their minds and returned to the Soviet Union: two from Canada and one from the United States.

Sub-Saharan Africa

Commentary Views Sudanese Coup Attempt

EA2006115489 Moscow International Service in Swahili 1730 GMT 19 Jun 89

[Station commentary]

[Text] News agencies have reported an attempt to overthrow the Sudanese Government. Who planned the foiled coup? Reports on the attempted coup were made public for the first time on Sunday [18 June] by the Sudanese Army headquarters. In a statement issued to the citizens it said that if the coup had succeeded, the former Sudanese President, Numayri, would have returned to power, but that the coup had failed.

The statement also said that all those involved in the conspiracy, among them military officers and ordinary citizens, have been arrested. The statement did not give the number of those arrested and their ranks, but it emphasized that an investigation into the matter would be started immediately and that the Armed Forces were firmly united in their task of protecting the government democratically elected by the people.

It is clear that more details of the failed coup will come through in the near future. However, at the moment it would seem possible to agree with the statement's conclusion that the coup was directed against the administrative institutions which have been established to satisfy the wishes of the Sudanese people. In 1986 there were general elections in Sudan which resulted in the formation of a civilian coalition government led by the

leader of the Ummah party, Sadiq al-Mahdi. The Army ruled for just 1 year after Numayri was overthrown in April 1985 before handing the reigns of power over to civilians. There are many political parties in Sudan, among them the Communist Party.

Many observers believe that behind the whole conspiracy could be the recent speech by the former Sudanese President Numayri, who, according to an AFP report, is now living in Egypt as a political refugee.

In his interview with the VOA, he condemned the government of Sadiq al-Mahdi and admitted that he was preparing to overthrow the government. On top of this, Mr Numayri confirmed that he was in direct contact with some of the officers of the Sudanese Army.

The attempted coup, which has been foiled does not represent the government's self-defense against such utterances. Given the fact that there are currently attempts being made to find a peaceful solution to the conflict in the south of the country, I do not think that the Sudanese leaders could accept any situation which would jeopardize their strengthened relations with the national Armed Forces.

Ethiopia's Mengistu Receives USSR Official

LD1906150189 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1410 GMT 19 Jun 89

[Text] Addis Ababa, 19 Jun (TASS)—Mengistu Haile Mariam, general secretary of the Ethiopian Workers' Party Central Committee and president of the People's Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, has received Yuriy Yukalov, head of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs African Countries' Department, who is in Addis Ababa.

The Ethiopian head of state was briefed on the main results of the Congress of People's Deputies of the USSR, on the congress' message to the peoples of the world, and on the first results of the work of the USSR Supreme Soviet session.

Mengistu Haile Mariam highly appraised the process of restructuring taking place in the Soviet Union, and wished success in implementing the foreign policy course dictated by the new political thinking.

On the basis of the message from the Soviet leadership which was conveyed to the Ethiopian president, a committed exchange of opinions took place on practical ways to achieve a political settlement of the Eritrean problems and establish peace and good-neighborly relations in the Horn of Africa.

USSR Responsibility for Ethiopian Situation Noted

LD2106180289 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 21 Jun 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpts] Our correspondent Aleksandr Kraminov reports on the military and political situation in Ethiopia:

[Kraminov] This is Keren, a town about 100 km from Asmara. It is the center of the province of Eritrea and is, essentially, the last town that is held by government troops in this direction. In effect, the front line passes through here. [passage omitted]

The rebel leaders are more and more frequently replacing the separatist and nationalist slogans with demands for the present regime to be ended and for truly socialist, as they say, power to be established. [passage omitted]

The truth has to be faced squarely. There is a certain share of responsibility on our part, too, for the tragedy of these people, because it was with our help that the largest army in black Africa—not counting the Republic of South Africa, of course—was created in this country, one of the world's poorest. Until recently, we, too, thought that Ethiopia's economic revival could start only after a government triumph in the north. The totally hopeless and even ruinous nature of such a road is now clear to everyone. The rains will provide Ethiopia with a 6-month respite. That time must be used in order to put an end to the fratricidal war that is bleeding the whole nation.

Shengo's Eritrean Peace Initiative Praised

EA1506154589 Moscow International Service in Amharic 1530 GMT 14 Jun 89

[Text] It will be recalled that at its 5 June meeting, the emergency session of the People's Democratic Republic of Ethiopia National Shengo unanimously passed a resolution to solve the Eritrean problem by peaceful means. A statement issued by the Soviet Government has described this decision as farsighted and responsible.

This is a correct opinion. It was clearly vital to find a solution to the armed struggle in northern Ethiopia. Those who have followed the developments in the northern part of Ethiopia from the beginning know that the Eritrean war is much older than the Ethiopian revolution. It is well known that the revolutionary Ethiopian Government has, since its inception, been endeavoring to solve the problem. The political statement approved in May 1976 called for a peaceful solution to the problem. The National Shengo decision, granting broad autonomy and budgetary independence to the northern region, pursued the same goal.

[Words indistinct] the leaders of the secessionists, who stuck to their stubborn ideas, refused to hold direct negotiations. As the armed conflict worsened, many

people lost their lives and the economy of the region and the country as a whole was very much disrupted. The recent emergency meeting of the Ethiopian parliament called for unconditional talks. This is a new step toward achieving peace.

If an open meeting between the conflicting sides, including (?internal enemies), were to be held, it would be a big opportunity for all those forces which want to see peace prevail in Ethiopia. According to unofficial reports from London, the Tigray People's Liberation Front has expressed readiness to accept the Shengo peace initiative and hold negotiations quickly, so as to stop the loss of human life and destruction of property. It is sad that the other main secessionist group, the Eritrean People's Liberation Front, has misinterpreted the new peace initiative, claiming that it is intended to confuse the people.

For understanding to prevail, goodwill and readiness to negotiate are necessary. Negotiations will clarify the positions of the conflicting parties and benefit Ethiopia. In this way it is possible to reach a peaceful solution. If open negotiations are held, the people will realize who is in the right. War has never brought a constructive solution to any problem, including the question of nationalities. The Soviet statement says that peace talks are needed to stop the bloodshed, safeguard the interests of the Ethiopian people, solve the problems, and reorganize the region.

It also says that the Soviet Union is ready to do whatever it can to help implement the Ethiopian parliament's peace initiative. The Soviet Government urged all those who wish to see peace prevail in the Horn of Africa to cooperate in the peace process, for it is essential to obtain peace for the long-suffering Ethiopian people.

Adamishin, Burundi Foreign Minister Meet 21 Jun
LD1506204989 Moscow in English to Africa 1700 GMT 14 Jun 89

[Text] In Moscow on Wednesday [21 June] Deputy Foreign Minister Anatoliy Adamishin conferred with Burundi's foreign minister, Cyprien Mbonimpa, who had come to the USSR for a working visit. The two men reaffirmed the coincidence or proximity of their country's outlooks on a number of world problems. Mr Mbonimpa spoke about the Soviet foreign policy with great respect. The memory of Soviet aid to liberation movements in Africa is still alive on the continent, he said. The two diplomats discussed the development and prospects of bilateral cooperation in different areas.

Preferential Trade Area Meeting Held in Arusha
EA1806204489 Moscow International Service in Swahili 1730 GMT 17 Jun 89

[Text] Our correspondent (Vitaliy Vyelo Borotko), who is in Tanzania, comments on the ordinary session of the Preferential Trade Area [PTA] in eastern and southern Africa taking place in Arusha. The session is first and foremost discussing economic cooperation among the 16 member-states. The purpose of the PTA, which was formed in 1984, is to develop its ability to produce in order to protect itself from multinational injustice. As a result of its efforts a system of payments in foreign exchange within the organization has been realized. There has also been a reduction of trade imbalances in several countries. Furthermore, a system of contracting business agreements under the organization has been designed to protect member states from interference from multinationals. However, the problems facing the organization still exceed those for which solutions have been found. Foremost is the problem of solving future economic problems in the region. Undoubtedly trade for the common good calls for reduced customs duties on consumer goods. This would facilitate the solution of this important problem facing eastern and southern Africa. Such issues are being addressed in Arusha. The session was officially opened by the president of Tanzania, Ali Hassan Mwinyi, who, among other things, called on member states to curb imports from Western countries of goods which can be manufactured by member states. Although several meetings of the session are being held behind closed doors, it became known today that the Comoro Islands and Djibouti have proposed the launching of a joint computer data bank to facilitate and promote trade between member states. The outcome of the session is expected to be made public in the next day or two.

Angolan Party Auditing Experts Study CPSU Work
PM2006104389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Jun 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Representatives' Stay"]

[Text] Under the plan for interparty ties between the CPSU and the Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola-Labor Party [MPLA-PT] a delegation of the MPLA-PT Central Control and Auditing Commission headed by A. Rodrigues (Quito), member of the Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the Central Control and Auditing Commission, visited the USSR 6 through 14 June.

The delegation was received by V.K. Pugo, chairman of the CPSU Central Committee Party Control Committee. The delegation had talks at the CPSU Central Auditing Commission, and traveled to Stavropol and Krasnodar Krays to familiarize itself with the activities of CPSU control and auditing organs in the provinces.

East Europe

Gerasimov Clarifies Soviet Stance on Nagy Burial
LD2006154989 Budapest Domestic Service in Hungarian 1400 GMT 20 Jun 89

[Text] At today's news conference, our Moscow correspondent asked the Foreign Ministry spokesman about the TASS commentary on the 16 June burial in Budapest.

[Darath] The TASS evaluation on the burial of Imre Nagy and his comrades can be considered as the personal opinion of commentator Kondrashev. It does not reflect the official Soviet stance. Foreign Ministry spokesman Gerasimov said this today at his news conference. In the rather sharply toned analysis, Kondrashev stated that the memorial service held on 16 June in Hungary did not facilitate national reconciliation. It was an occasion for anti-Soviet and anti-socialist attacks directed against the international obligations of Hungary and the Hungarian Socialist Workers Party. Kondrashev, in agreement with the Romanian and Czechoslovak evaluations, outlined that inciting the activism of the enemies of socialism endangers the foreign relations of Hungary.

In reply to my question as to what the official Soviet stance is, Gerasimov said:

[Begin Gerasimov recording in Russian with superimposed Hungarian translation] During the memorial service, certain speakers made anti-Soviet attacks. We naturally noticed these, but our stance is that these represent neither the stance of the Hungarian Government nor that of the Hungarian people. [end recording]

'Vociferous' Anti-Soviet Demonstration in Krakow

LD2206102589 Moscow TASS in English 0955 GMT 22 Jun 89

[Text] Warsaw June 22 TASS—A vociferous demonstration was again staged in Krakow on Wednesday by extremist-minded young people from the so-called Confederation of Independent Poland, the pseudo-pacific organisation Wolnosc I Pokui, the Independent Union of Students, and other groups, including the Anarchist International.

Following a meeting in the main market—the historical centre of Krakow—the demonstrators marched past the Soviet Consulate to the Voivodship Committee of the Polish United Workers' Party, shouting slogans of anti-Soviet and anti-Communist content. Traffic was brought to a standstill in the downtown area for quite a while.

A brief reportage about the demonstration in Krakow was broadcast in the evening news bulletin of the Polish central television network.

Zaykov, GDR's Schabowski Open Berlin Festival

PM1406092789 Moscow MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 1 Jun 89 p 3

[MOSTASS correspondent L. Kislinskaya report: "Readiness for Dialogue"]

[Text] The Berlin Days in Moscow, which opened 31 May, have become a celebration of the inviolable friendship between the USSR and GDR peoples, and of the fruitful cooperation between the two fraternal capitals.

A delegation from the GDR led by G. Schabowski, member of the Politburo and secretary of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany [SED] Central Committee and first secretary of Berlin SED Bezirk Committee, arrived in the Soviet capital to take part in the festival's opening ceremony. The delegation included E. Krack, member of the SED Central Committee and mayor of Berlin; G. Gerlikh [name as transliterated], member of the SED Central Committee and chairman of the Berlin organization of the GDR Writers' Union; L. Witt, candidate member of the SED Central Committee and first secretary of Berlin-Koepenick SED District Organization; E. Brombacher, secretary of Berlin SED Bezirk Committee; A. Weissbach-Rieger, chairman of the GDR National Front Committee; K. Foerster, director of the national microelectronic components enterprise; and U. Timmermann, student at the Higher Economic School and shot put world record holder.

V.T. Saykin, chairman of Moscow City Soviet Executive Committee, and Yu.A. Prokofyev, second secretary of Moscow CPSU City Committee [gorkom], met the guests at the airport.

A meeting took place between L.N. Zaykov, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and first secretary of Moscow CPSU Gorkom, and G. Schabowski.

During the conversation, which took place in a friendly atmosphere, the unity of the CPSU and SED political course—the foundation of our peoples' common achievements on the path of socialist building—was stressed.

L.N. Zaykov informed his guests of the work of Moscow's Communists on the practical implementation of the 19th All-Union Party Conference decisions. He talked about the work of the Congress of People's Deputies, which demonstrates the entire novelty and democratic nature of the processes now taking place in our country.

G. Schabowski thanked L.N. Zaykov for the interesting conversation, which familiarized him with the Moscow party organization's intensive working rhythm. He talked about the work and tasks of Berlin SED Bezirk Committee.

G. Koenig, GDR ambassador to the Soviet Union, took part in the meeting.

A treaty was signed on developing cooperation among party, soviet, trade union and youth organizations, and labor collectives in Moscow and Berlin.

The delegation visited the V.I. Lenin Mausoleum and laid a wreath—a tribute to the memory of the founder of the Communist Party and the Soviet state.

A wreath was also laid at the grave of the Unknown Soldier. Yu.A. Prokofyev took part in the wreath laying.

The ceremonial opening of the Berlin Days in Moscow took place in the evening in the State Central Concert Hall. Representatives of the Moscow public, labor collectives, and figures from the scientific and cultural worlds were assembled there. The official delegation from Berlin, G. Koenig, and guests from the GDR were also here.

L.N. Zaykov spoke at the ceremony. He said that we are pleased to welcome the guests—production frontrankers and innovators, scientific and cultural figures, and activists from party, trade union, and youth organizations and from the Berlin Bezirk GDR-Soviet Friendship Society Board, who had come to the opening of the Berlin Days in Moscow. On behalf of Moscow CPSU Gorkom and Moscow Soviet, and on behalf of the city's working people, L.N. Zaykov cordially welcomed the delegation of guests present in the hall.

In greeting our esteemed guests from the GDR we are greeting the SED, the Communists and working people of the GDR and its capital. Considerable experience of cooperation has been accumulated during the years of friendship between our capitals.

The treaty on further developing ties between Moscow and Berlin party, soviet, trade union, and communist youth league organizations and labor collectives is also directed at stepping up the processes of economic cooperation.

It was stressed that right now, during the meeting, a special public atmosphere reigns in Moscow—the USSR Congress of People's Deputies is meeting in the very heart of the Land of the Soviets, the Moscow Kremlin. Muscovites, like all Soviet people, are following the Congress' work very closely and have high hopes that urgent socioeconomic problems will be resolved.

The confidence was expressed that the Berlin Days in Moscow will be a worthy contribution to the development of friendship between our capitals' inhabitants, and will strengthen fraternal ties between our parties, countries, and peoples.

L.N. Zaykov declared the Berlin Days in Moscow open.

G. Schabowski delivered a speech of greeting. He thanked everyone for the warm reception and read out a message from E. Honecker, general secretary of the SED Central Committee and chairman of the GDR State Council, which said:

"Dear Muscovites!

"On the occasion of the Berlin Days in Moscow, during which Berlin is presenting itself in the year of the GDR's 40th anniversary, I send sincere greetings to you and, to the capital of the Soviet land, best wishes for prosperity.

"The meeting between our two capitals is a topical expression of this friendship and the strong ties which linked the people of the GDR with the peoples of the Soviet Union as soon as the GDR was formed. In a few weeks time our visit on the occasion of the 60th anniversary of the city of Magnitogorsk and the V.I. Lenin metallurgical combine, which I too helped to construct as a young Communist, will bear witness to this. As you can see, our fraternal union has its own historical traditions, bears rich fruit in the present, and promises good chances for the future.

"The labor and life of Berliners reflect our efforts aimed at fully revealing the potential of socialism in people's interests. This is both a joint struggle for disarmament and to rid mankind of the threat of a nuclear catastrophe, as well as increasingly close cooperation in mastering the most advanced science and technology for the good of the people and in answer to the challenges of our times. We have a great need to exchange experience in order to constantly improve the living conditions of all citizens, ensure a highly developed education system, and deepen and broaden socialist democracy and the real participation of people in all social affairs for the good of the people.

"When we met with M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, in Moscow in September last year we jointly opened a new chapter in militant collaboration between the SED and the CPSU, and also in our states' interaction in all spheres of social life.

"Everything that Berlin is showing Muscovites during the Berlin Days of 1989 reflects the multifaceted life of a million-strong socialist city, a life which is being shaped by the targeted directives of the 11th SED Congress and preparations for the party's 12th congress. At the center of attention is the continuation of the tried and tested course of unity of economic and social policy, which guarantees the GDR population economic growth, full employment, social protection, socialist democracy, and the implementation of human rights. All transformations in the political, economic, social, and cultural spheres which we are implementing in the present and will implement in the future are aimed at this.

"Dynamic economic development, which is a basic condition for effective partnership ties, is regarded by the GDR as the most effective contribution to strengthening the socialist community and as a way of assisting the Soviet people in their successful fulfillment of the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress and the 19th All-Union Party Conference for the good of Soviet people and in the interests of a peaceful life for all peoples. The significance of cooperation between Berlin and Moscow and between the party organizations of these two cities cannot be overestimated and it is of benefit to both partners.

"I am sure that the numerous friendly meetings between the inhabitants of Berlin and Moscow during these days will promote the further deepening of fraternal unity between our two countries."

G. Schabowski noted that the Berlin Days in Moscow and the Moscow Days in Berlin are very popular. Such meetings strengthen contacts between the inhabitants of both our capitals even further and enable them to become more closely acquainted and to exchange information on various aspects of existence, daily life, and work.

The speaker noted that this year has been special for their country. This year we are mentally reviewing the path of the changes which our city has made in the 40 years of development of the socialist German state.

Gratitude was expressed to the Soviet people who have helped restore the capital of the GDR. This serves as a constant impetus to friendship and class solidarity with their Soviet brothers. The present Berlin Days in Moscow, G. Schabowski stressed, will be an important landmark on the road to the further development of the indestructible friendship between the peoples of the USSR and the GDR. The meeting shows the readiness for dialogue of our two capitals, peoples, and countries.

The evening concluded with a festive gala concert featuring leading artistes from the GDR. Over a period of 5 days in Moscow there will be meetings of labor collectives, party, soviet, and economic officials, young people, and trade union activists of the two capitals. The range of the visitors' cultural program is diverse.

Solovyev Meets With Dresden Delegation
LD1706203289 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 17 Jun 89

[Text] All last week Leningraders were experiencing a holiday of internationalist friendship—"Days of Dresden," twinned with the town on the Neva—concluded there. Friendly links have been developing now for more than 3 decades. This time the traditional festivities were dedicated to the 30th anniversay of the GDR's formation. Solovyev, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Leningrad Ob|ast party committee, and Modrow, member of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany Central Committee and first secretary of the Dresden district party committee, at a friendly meeting at Smolnyy with the Dresden District delegation expressed the conviction that the Days of Dresden have given new momentum to the development of diverse ties between the two cities.

Poland-GDR Sea Border Dispute Settled
PM1606120089 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Jun 89 Morning Edition p 5

[Own correspondent L. Toporkov report: "Compromise in the Pomeranian Bay: The Longstanding Dispute Between Poland and the GDR on the Sea Border Is Resolved"]

[Text] Warsaw—A dispute had been going on for many years which had started casting a shadow over international relations, until then apparently exemplary. Back in 1977, when, under the new international law of the sea, both sides started extending their territorial waters from 3 miles to 12, it became obvious that this was resulting in notable losses for Poland.

Poland's complex of ports from Sz czecin to Swinoujscie, which was vigorously developed in the postwar years, always had direct access from the inner Sz czecin Gulf to the Pomeranian Bay, in other words, to the open sea. Vessels would leave Swinoujscie (the outer harbor of Sz czecin) along the old sea canal which was built before the war, and those that were waiting to enter the port would stand at two anchorages along the route of the canal. The condition of the canal was constantly monitored by special services, which spent tens of billions of zlotys up to 1977 on making it deeper and maintaining it. And now an unforeseen situation has come about, whereby the sea territory through which a large part of Poland's vitally important canal runs, has turned out to belong to the GDR.

The GDR put its rights there into effect by a special decision. Poland did not agree with this decision, as it communicated to the GDR Government in an official note. Long and difficult talks began. They did not proceed without regrettable incidents in the sea canal.

"Now we can say with a clear conscience that the unpleasantness is behind us," Jerzy Monkos, deputy director of the First Department of the Polish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, who participated in the talks to establish a sea border between Poland and the GDR, said. "Compromise and goodwill prevailed. Recently in Berlin, as has already been reported in the press, the two countries' foreign ministers signed an agreement on the Pomeranian Bay border, in the presence of W. Jaruzelski and E. Honecker, thus confirming that by means of talks it is possible to successfully resolve the most complicated problems of bilateral relations. The two sides proceeded from the basic principle that the Sz czecin-Swinoujscie complex of ports must have direct access to the sea, as in the past. It cannot do without the existing canal. Well, but what could compensate for the loss of part of the GDR's sea territory? Only a section of the Polish shelf which is also suitable as a fishing ground. And it is not small, being 158 square km. In response, the GDR changed its decision and moved the border back from the axis of the canal, 0.6 miles to the west.

"The treaty signed in Berlin is the common success of both states," my interlocutor stressed. "By concluding it, they set a good example of compromise in the spirit of respect for mutual interests."

Socialist countries are learning to resolve problems that are sometimes highly complicated and even conflictual, which previously it was not customary to mention aloud. Now, for example, talks are in progress between Poland and the CSSR. And they also concern a subject which cannot be called easy: the protection of the environment, which knows and recognizes no borders. The CSSR has decided to build a coking plant near the border with Poland, harmful waste from which will inevitably affect the inhabitants of Polish territory.

"Socialist countries," the newspaper ZYCIE WARSZAWY writes on this matter, "are faced with difficult challenges—foreign and domestic, political and economic. These are approached in different ways in different countries, but one thing is certain: We have a common responsibility for the state and effectiveness of integration. It can produce results only by means of concrete dialogue. Such as the one carried out in Berlin."

On 13 June in Warsaw there was an exchange of documents of ratification. Thus the agreement on the sea border between Poland and the GDR came into force.

West Europe

Turkish, U.S. Stance on MiG Hijacking Criticized

PM2106084789 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Jun 89 Moscow Evening Edition p 4

[V. Matveyev "Political Observer's Opinion": "Who Is Being Given Shelter?"]

[Text] This is by no means the first time the authorities in Turkey have extended their protection to people who should suffer deserved punishment as terrorist bandits having committed a criminal offense involving both bloodshed and the violation of international law. It happened in 1970 with the Brazinskas father and son who murdered flight attendant N.V. Kurchenko and wounded two other crew members during the hijack of an AN-24 passenger aircraft to Turkey. It is well known that the criminals got away with light sentences and were given an opportunity to move on to the United States, where they are enjoying shelter from Soviet justice to this day despite demands for their extradition.

The Soviet side pointed out that acting in this fashion means encouraging acts of violence which are fraught with grave consequences also in the sphere of international relations. The correctness of these warnings was unfortunately confirmed by yet another provocative instance of indulgence by the Turkish authorities for gangsterism on the ground and in the air. The issue concerns, as was pointed out in the USSR Foreign Ministry statement handed to Turkish Ambassador to the USSR V. Vural on 14 June, the refusal to extradite to the Soviet Union the criminal offender A.M. Zuyev who hijacked a MiG-29 fighter aircraft from Tskhakaya Airport in Georgia to Trabzon Airport in Turkey. In the process he seriously wounded a serviceman guarding the aircraft. Furthermore, after capturing the aircraft and taking off, Zuyev attempted to fire its guns at the aircraft ramp. Only the effective weapon-lock system prevented an even more serious disaster.

The actual facts concerning the events at Tskhakaya Airport were brought to the notice of competent authorities in Turkey and they—taking these facts into account—should have acted in conformity with the norms of international law and also in line with the declaration by Turkish President K. Evren in early 1986: "If we want to put an end to terrorism, all countries must extradite terrorists to the countries where the crimes were committed and which demand the extradition of the terrorists."

It was only recently that Turkey's representatives, participating in an international meeting on problems of combating terrorism held in Belgrade, joined the demands for more decisive measures in this sphere, including measures for eradicating drug trafficking.

But surely the capture of a military aircraft or any other act involving the use of modern weapons for terrorist purposes is an equally grave crime? What will happen in today's world, chockablock with all sorts of weapons including nuclear missiles, if lawbreakers who take the path of terrorism not only evade due punishment but actually have their acts of violence supported at the state level in various countries?

This is exactly what happened to Zuyev after he used weapons to capture a military aircraft, hijacked it, illegally crossed the border, invaded a neighboring country's territorial space, and afterwards announced that he was "seeking political asylum." A thug armed to the teeth could equally as well break into a house and announce that he is seeking shelter from bad weather!

There are limits to everything, including to judicial maneuvers. What are the grounds, one might ask, not only for Turkey's court and even higher authorities being unwilling to return a proven criminal to the authorities of the country whose citizen he is and where a gross act of terrorism was committed, but also for exonerating him of all responsibility whatsoever?

Turkey is a signatory to international conventions and agreements providing for the unconditional extradition of terrorists and their punishment. We are dealing with such a case now. Evidently the trial process in Turkey was swift but unjust according to all, even the most liberal, norms and measures.

Judging by Turkish press reports, the criminal was not treated as a respondent but was actually given an opportunity to make demands on the local authorities. He declared, for example, that he "must" depart immediately for the United States. And it seems as if the demand in question has not been turned down by official departments either in Ankara or in Washington. This being so, and if the appropriate authorities in the United States take on responsibility for sheltering someone who did not hesitate to commit an act of terrorism involving modern weapons, what would such a fatal spiral produce for the United States itself?

One would think that, in these circumstances, official Washington spokesmen should not prevaricate but should make it clear that a terrorist who is a serviceman of another country will never find shelter on U.S. soil. But what do we hear from the banks of the Potomac? In the context of this incident, some high-ranking U.S. figures demonstrated not concern for the observance of international law and legality but something else which is totally divorced from this concern. They did not hesitate to publicly express regret that U.S. specialists did not manage to "familiarize themselves" with the Soviet fighter before it was returned to the USSR.

There is no need to say that such dual morality in questions of combatting terrorism are not to the credit of its proponents.

The MiG-29 hijacking episode is not closed and will never be closed until justice triumphs.

New UK Labour Party Platform, Elections Viewed

PM2106140789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Jun 89 Second Edition p 4

[Dispatch by own correspondent T. Kolesnichenko: "The Labourites Set Sail: Color Change in the British Political Spectrum"]

[Text] London, June—First, a sensation: The Labourites win the general election, gaining another 89 seats in parliament, that is, a majority. The Conservatives lose 85 seats. They are left with only 290. The Democrats and the Social Democratic Party lose three seats. They have 19 altogether.

Excuse me, the reader will say, but the parliamentary elections are still a long way off. Yes, but if the election were to be held now... I will not whet the reader's curiosity. Politics, like history, will not tolerate the subjunctive mood. This also applies to the Labourites, who, as the well-known commentator P. Jenkins put it, are still at the foot of an "electoral Everest." They have yet to climb it. And no one knows whether the climb will be successful. But the sensation has swept the British press. The figures I cited are based on an analysis of recent by-elections and local elections in which 1 million voters participated. The Labourites were victorious, moreover (and this is particularly important), in constituencies that have traditionally been regarded as Conservative strongholds. They have not had such success for more than 50 years.

The election results and many public opinion polls, particularly in connection with the Conservatives' celebration of 10 years in office, demonstrated that we can already talk about colors changing in the British political spectrum. At any rate, one thing is clear—the idea of a "third" alternative party to the Labourites has bitten the dust.

The Labour leader and his colleagues are busy consolidating the success and turning it into a national election triumph. "We are back!" "The next election is ours." Citing these and similar statements by Kinnock, the British press publishes pictures of him, already treating quite seriously this politician's candidacy as the next British prime minister.

At least two facts open up a "window of opportunity" for him, so they write here. First, Kinnock has at last succeeded in taking control of the National Executive Committee and the party itself, of which he became leader in 1983. And although many internal contradictions remain and could still make an impact, the Labourites' consolidation process is by and large approaching completion and they can now face the voter and stop settling scores with one another, as has been happening in the past.

Second, the Labourites have presented the public with what is effectively a new program. The review process has been going on since October 1987. The new platform was put together with reference to a meticulous record of Tory errors, the mood of the electorate, and the new economic problems facing the country. All this is topped with political publicity and packaged in a bright propaganda "wrapping."

Eyes fixed firmly on the election, Kinnock and his entourage are prepared to pay a big, even excessive, many in the party believe, price for victory. In diplomatic language this is called a "shift toward the center," but what it is essentially is a complete revision of traditional Labour values and the public transformation of the party, which used to call itself the "party of the workers," into the party of the "middle class." Like a desperate apostate, Kinnock is frantically tearing his political shirt and publicly repenting past sins.

The Labourites' very goal—socialism (in its social democratic interpretation, of course)—has also undergone revision. In his recent speeches Kinnock has said: "We live in a capitalist society and our aim is not to lead toward socialism, but to make capitalism work better." The Labourites no longer talk about nationalization "in the traditional sense." There is less and less mention of state enterprises sold off by Thatcher. They only propose to bring "British Telecom" back into the state sector,

having first bought back all the shares. They talk in vague, general terms about water resources, some of which are already in private hands. Moreover, the "unlimited opportunities" promised to big capital will be encouraged by private investment, in particular investments in long-term projects and so on and so forth.

The most interesting thing is the attitude toward the trade unions. The party leadership is prepared to review the nature of its traditionally very close links with the trade unions. Many of Thatcher's anti-trade union measures, which had been called "draconian," now no longer anger the party's leaders. All this, of course, is a gesture to the "middle class" voter, so that he does not suspect the party of "plotting " with the trade unions and supporting their "diktat."

To be fair, one would say that the Labour Party's "review" is by no means Kinnock's discovery, and it was not he who started it. Kinnock is really just dotting the "i's," as they say. Moreover, what they are setting is a practical task—achieving office. In a country like Britain, this cannot be achieved without the support of the mass voter. And if the Labourites are regarded primarily as an alternative to the Conservatives it must be admitted that their program has a much more elaborate social policy and it is closer to the needs of broad strata of the population. It is not a "program for the rich" and it is not "pure capitalism"—it reflects general human values and concern for the environment and scientific and cultural development.

The Labourites' new platform contains a total of 70,000 words. Everything seems to be included—from taxes and electronics to new dog registration rules. They are now left with the "little" task of putting the program into practice. If it is not just promises, as has often been the case before, but a "realistic policy," as Kinnock is fond of saying, it will shift the country by and large to the left in the social plane.

The same could be said of the foreign policy set out in the document entitled "Britain in the World." At the moment the strongest emotions are focused on the decision by the National Executive Committee, which voted by a majority in favor of rejecting the principle of unilateralism—unilateral nuclear disarmament. This is not completely clear as yet. A struggle lies ahead, and the final word will be given in October, at the next party conference. Although the majority of observers believe that Kinnock, having taken control of the party, can win in October, that is, establish his policy. People here well remember that at last year's conference in Blackpool ordinary Labourites rejected the leaders' decision to abandon unilateralism. And that despite the fact that unilateralism, in the common opinion of observers, was one of the chief reasons for the election defeat—"the longest suicide in history."

Why are passions so inflamed? There appear to be several reasons. We are not talking about some hypothetical situation (although Kinnock himself has repeatedly said in the past that "in no circumstances will he press the nuclear button"), but about a principled philosophical approach to nuclear weapons. Unilateralism means calling nuclear weapons immoral, rejecting the very right to use them. The participants in the British antinuclear movement and millions of Britons supported this slogan, turning it into a campaign for the total prohibition and destruction of nuclear weapons. Now that Kinnock is lowering his moral sights, he is justly being accused (even by Thatcher!) of politicking, of departing from principles to "catch votes." We must not retreat from unilateralism, the left of the party is saying, but wage a struggle for it and make the electorate appreciate the high moral purpose of this principle. In time, they believe, this principle will prevail. But the Labourites' leaders will not wait, time is passing. In 2 years' time there will be an election. Thatcher, in their view, must be stopped by hook or by crook.

The Labourites are also sharply divided from the Conservatives by their policy toward the EEC. Thatcher, Labour shadow foreign minister G. Kaufman, for example, claims, has gone up a political blind alley. She is more involved with fighting "socialism" in the Common Market in the name of "Britain's independence." But the Labourites are prepared by 1992, when a "single Europe" is to emerge, without borders and customs, to cooperate actively in it. EEC headquarters in Brussels is becoming increasingly sympathetic toward their voice, hoping ultimately to see not an opponent, but a partner in London. On 15 June, at the European parliamentary elections, which are an important domestic political baromter, the Labourites obtained the vast majority of votes.

The "European theme" has come to the fore since the NATO jubilee summit in Brussels. Thatcher is effectively isolated, having adopted at the meeting the hardest and most intransigent line, primarily on the question of the reduction of conventional armaments and tactical nuclear weappons in Europe. Even U.S. President Bush was "left" of the British premier, not to mention the FRG and many other session participants. And the Labourites are now, of course, trying to take advantage of this fact and of Thatcher's recent unfriendly gestures toward the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

The Labourites' new platform, on the basis of which they are summoning the electorate to their banners (or, more accurately, to the red rose—it has replaced the red flag), looks today like a serious alternative to the Conservatives. It has to be said that not everyone here thinks so. Particular emphasis is placed on the word "today." It is still 2 years to the election, they say. Moreover, the Labourites' triumphant "7 days in May" coincided with the wave of criticism that hit the government in connection with the 10th anniversary of Thatcher's residence at No 10 Downing Street and criticism of her personally. And there is an element of truth in this.

Ten years ago, when Britain was at a historical crossroads, a leader such as Margaret Thatcher was simply essential. It has to be said that Thatcher shook the country up and carried out much restructuring, and, the British government offices claim, the country started to have a better life. Better? Now this is the crux of the matter. It is a question of interpreting what is better and what is worse. Better off, richer—yes. But that is by no means everything. To be honest, the polls (and they were conducted by all the main services—Mori, Harris, and Gallup) were surprising: Most Britons consider that life is worse, although they are richer—crime has increased, as has people's alienation. They have become, according to those questioned, "more aggressive, egotistical, and indifferent toward one anothber."

When Thatcher came to power she said: "Our means is the economy, our aim is to change hearts." Now, 10 years on, it is clear that she has failed to implement this slogan. Of course, Britons are changing, like anyone else. But, and this is the paradox, not at all in the way Thatcher would like. They are increasingly abandoning the "shopkeeper philosophy." They are losing interest in getting rich. For example, most of those questioned would prefer a cleaner environment to higher wages. They are prepared to pay higher taxes to preserve the parks and gardens of Britain's cities. This vein of public-spiritedness is entirely out of step with Thatcher's idea of a "nation of entrepreneurs." So, it seems, there are considerable changes taking place in the British social consciousness. It is they, above all, that present the Labourites with a "window of opportunity."

The electorate can follow the Labourites not because they get along very well with them, but because the Conservatives have, as it were, exhausted themselves and they are being overtaken by time and new ideas. While giving Thatcher her due, the newspaper THE GUARDIAN, for example, remarks: "She cannot, she is unable to prepare us for the 21st century, for the time when the idea of close contact between people will triumph, rather than the idea of individualism, when international cooperation will be the soundest and most enduring prospect."

Time is on the Labourites' side. But much depends on the art of handling the ship. You have to identify the direction of the wind and choose the right course. All this is to come. The Labourites are only just setting sail.

Latin America & Caribbean

Further Reportage on Vorotnikov's Visit to Brazil

Vorotnikov Meets Sao Paulo Businessmen

PM2006120589 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 17 Jun 89 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "A Broad Exchange of Opinions: The USSR Supreme Soviet Delegation's Visit to Sao Paulo"]

[Text] Sao Paulo 16 Jun—A meeting between the USSR Supreme Soviet delegation now in Brazil and the leadership of the federation of Sao Paulo industrialists was devoted to a discussion on the further development of bilateral Soviet-Brazilian cooperation.

The head of the Soviet delegation, V.I. Vorotnikov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Supreme Soviet Presidium, informed the Brazilian entrepreneurs about the USSR's conceptual approach to questions of deepening foreign economic ties and scientific-technical collaboration with foreign countries.

We want, he noted, to radically change the present nature of bilateral economic relations, give them greater dynamism, balance, and versatility and bring them into line with the true economic potential of both sides.

It is time to shift broadly to new forms such as setting up joint enterprises, organizing cooperation among banks, and securing access to third country markets—areas in which we are at the moment taking only initial steps.

There are real spheres in which our countries, on the basis of economic complementarity, could substantially activate economic ties. In particular, the USSR could cooperate with Brazil in the sphere of ferrous and non-ferrous metallurgy, the power industry, irrigation, and also railroad transport.

Brazil in turn possesses experience and achievements of interest to us in the sphere of the production, processing, and preservation of agricultural products. The Brazilian side could participate in the modernization of Soviet light and food industry enterprises. Brazilian firms could process in the Soviet Union types of raw materials such as coking coal which the country's industry urgently needs. A further improvement in mutual economic ties would be made possible by forming a Soviet-Brazilian coordination committee, which would function using a base of sector or multisector associations. In this connection we are looking forward with interest to the impending talks in Moscow with the leaders of large Brazilian state companies.

The current thorough reform of the foreign economic ties mechanism in the USSR and also the improvement of the legal basis for coordination with foreign partners, the head of the Soviet delegation stressed, create good preconditions for the future development of trade with Brazil.

He pointed out that making the USSR part of the system of world economic relations is our principal policy, stemming organically from the restructuring now being implemented in the USSR. The Soviet side has the political will to make relations with Brazil harmonious, mutually advantageous, and stable, the head of the USSR Supreme Soviet delegation stated.

Mario Amato, president of the Sao Paulo industrialists' federation, speaking at the meeting, supported the idea of moving bilateral ties on to a completely new level. He stressed that the Brazilian industrialists are ready to take part in this process, which is bound to promote the strengthening of both countries' economies.

I am confident that broadening economic cooperation between the USSR and Brazil, between Latin America and the socialist countries, meets the tasks of promoting progress and increasing the peoples' prosperity, he said.

In the evening the representatives of large Brazilian firms and companies arranged a reception in honor of the Soviet delegation, where the enthusiastic, business-like exchange of opinions continued. Earlier the same day the USSR Supreme Soviet delegation had visited the major Brazilian aircraft construction firm "Embraer" in the city of Sao Jose dos Campos near Sao Paulo. The Soviet guests were familiarized with the enterprise shops and its production organization. At the end of the visit V.I. Vorotnikov answered questions put by representatives of the local media.

Another section of the delegation went on an excursion to the municipality of Campinas, where they visited science and research institutes concerned with agricultural development problems.

Comments on Visit Before Departure

PM2006154789 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 19 Jun 89 Morning Edition p3

[TASS report: "Mutual Interest in Developing Cooperation"]

[Text] Rio de Janeiro, 18 Jun—A delegation of the USSR Supreme Soviet led by V.I. Vorotnikov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Supreme Soviet Presidium, was in Brazil 11-18 June 1989 at the invitation of this country's National Congress. Before the delegation flew home, V.I. Vorotnikov gave an interview to a TASS correspondent in which he said, in particular:

I believe that, to a certain extent, the visit has gone beyond relations between our countries' parliaments. In addition to our meetings with the speakers of both chambers of the Brazilian National Congress and the lesiglative assemblies of the states of San Paolo and Rio de Janeiro, we had very interesting, meaningful conversations with President Jose Sarney, Foreign Minister Roberto Sodre, and representatives of the country's business circles. I have been very impressed by the interest shown by Brazilian statesmen and politicians, parliamentarians, and business people in the development of cooperation with the Soviet Union. The agreements signed during President J. Sarney's official visit to the USSR last year are beginning to take on real substance. Representatives of the two countries have begun to meet more frequently. A number of Soviet delegations at various levels, including a USSR Academy of Sciences delegation led by its president, G.I. Marchuk, visited Brazil just before our own visit.

Our interlocutors took a very thorough, detailed interest in the situation in the Soviet Union. They have all unanimously remarked on the importance of the processes taking place in the USSR and M.S. Gorbachev's role in actively establishing new thinking in the world. With the arrival of M.S. Gorbachev, our interlocutors emphasized more than once, a new era began in relations between countries with different sociopolitical systems which is characterized by new approaches to the problems of disarmament, security, and international economic cooperation.

We have also said that certain factors impeding the broadening of ties between the Soviet Union and Latin American countries have now been overcome. Military regimes impeding the development of relations between us have left the stage and we ourselves have overcome our narrow views of Latin American problems. New prospects for cooperation are opening up. This cooperation can now be implemented at various levels: Union republics, cities, enterprises, cooperatives, medium and small firms, and joint capital companies.

The main conclusion that can be drawn from these conversations is that we have a mutual interest in developing multifaceted cooperation in the political sphere, along state channels, in the economy, science, and culture, and in the solution of social and humanitarian problems.

In my view, this visit has been timely and useful. We must now work actively to utilize the possibilities opening up for the development and strengthening of ties not only with Brazil but with other Latin American countries. The prospects for this cooperation are vast, V.I. Vorotnikov said in conclusion.

Delegation Returns to Moscow

LD1906194889 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 19 Jun 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet delegation headed by Vitaliy Vorotnikov, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee, chairman of the Presidium of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet, returned to Moscow today. The delegation was in Brazil on an official friendly visit at the invitation of the national congress of that country. On their way back home, the delegation made a stopover in Morocco. At the airport, the delegation was met by Comrade Nikonov, and other officials.

Joint 'Announcement' on Soviet-Brazilian Talks

PM2006095789 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
19 Jun 89 Morning Edition p 3

[TASS-attributed "Joint Soviet-Brazilian Announcement on Visit by USSR Supreme Soviet Delegation"]

[Text] A USSR Supreme Soviet delgation led by V.I. Vorotnikov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, was in Brazil 11-18 June 1989 on an official visit at the invitation of the Brazilian National Congress.

The delegation was received by President Jose Sarney, to whom a personal message from M.S. Gorbachev was conveyed.

Meetings and conversations were held with the leadership of the National Congress—N. Carneiro, speaker of the federal Senate; A. Pais de Andrade, speaker of the Chamber of Deputies; Brazilian Foreign Minister R. Sodre; and other officials.

In the course of the talks, which proceeded in a business-like, friendly atmosphere, the sides exchanged information on the work of the two countries' parliaments and their activity with regard to international policies and the strengthening of bilateral relations. The Soviet delegation informed the Brazilian side on the essential features of the present stage in the Soviet restructuring process, which is geared to achieving a qualitatively new, higher level of development in the country on the basis of radical political and economic reform, broad democratization, the development of glasnost, and the renewal of all spheres of life in Soviet society. It was stressed that this course is oriented toward ensuring steady improvement in the Soviet peoples' well-being and is indissolubly linked with the Soviet Union's fundamental long-term policy in the international arena of strengthening peace and security, which is based on the new political thinking.

For their part, the Brazilian parliamentarians talked about the domestic political situation in their country, tasks connected with resolving economic and social problems, and also achievements in the task of consolidating representative democracy in their country.

Analyzing the situation in the world, the parliamentarians were agreed in the opinion that it is characterized by a development in positive trends and a move away from confrontation toward cooperation. They stressed the decisive significance of the aims and principles of the UN Charter with regard to maintaining peace, resolving disputes exclusively by peaceful means, ensuring equal, mutually advantageous cooperation, strengthening the atmosphere of trust and dialogue, and creating suitable conditions for the steady development of all countries, particularly developing countries. In this connection, the Brazilian parliamentarians stressed that the trends toward detente in international relations must have a positive impact on ties between industrially developed and developing countries.

The sides noted the enhanced role of their people's parliaments and official representatives in the task of promoting the further development of these processes and seeking ways to achieve lasting peace and strengthen international cooperation.

The Soviet deputies explained the Soviet foreign policy program and the essence of the Soviet initiatives designed to ensure the total elimination of nuclear and other types of mass destruction weapons, improve the situation in the world, and create a reliable international security system. The parliamentarians were unanimous that progress in the task of ridding mankind of the nuclear threat simultaneously entails progress toward the democratization of international relations and equality for all states and their equal responsibility for the fate of civilization. The United Nations is expected to play a very important role in the achievement of these noble aims. The two countries' representatives advocated of the need for all members of the international community to continue their concerted efforts in the task of consolidating and further developing positive trends in world politics and overcoming barriers in the way of ensuring mankind's survival.

Noting the historic importance of the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles, the participants in the talks expressed the hope that other agreements would be concluded, which would radically reduce the level of nuclear confrontation and create the preconditions for the broad, dynamic process of complete and universal disarmament with effective international verification. They stressed the importance of the earliest-possible achievement of accords for a 50-percent reduction in Soviet and U.S. strategic offensive weapons, preventing the militarization of space, ending nuclear arms tests and ensuring effective international verification measures in this connection, and ensuring that the conference on disarmament completes the drafting of an international convention to ban chemical weapons as soon as possible. The sides specially noted the importance of eliminating nuclear and other types of mass destruction weapons.

The parliamentarians confirmed their commitment to the principles of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and expressed full support for efforts to create zones in the world free of nuclear weapons. Noting the positive aspects of the Brazilian initiative which has led to the creation of a zone of peace and cooperation in the South Atlantic following the UN decision, they stressed the significance of all states' respecting this zone. Noting the growing role played by Latin American countries in the solution of cardinal problems of today, the two sides

appraised highly their contribution to preserving and strengthening international stability and security and curbing the arms race, including the nuclear arms race.

Noting the close link between disarmament and development and proceeding from the desire to promote the realization in practice of the "disarmament for development" principle, the parliamentarians indicated that the achievement of radical progress in the disarmament sphere would make it possible to channel additional resources into the solution of many of mankind's economic and social problems, particularly those of developing countries. The two sides spoke in favor of the need to take decisive measures to ease the burden of developing states' growing debts, restructure international economic relations on a just, democratic basis, and establish trade and finance and scientific and technical ties between states free of all discrimination.

The sides favored further improving international cooperation in the humanitarian sphere, particularly within the UN framework.

In the opinion of the two sides, the solution of ecological problems has important significance for maintaining and improving the quality of mankind's life. Stating the need for the world community to pay greater attention to these problems and implement international cooperation in order to resolve them, the sides stressed the importance of providing free access to ecologically safe, specialized environmental-conservation technology and creating conditions conducive to the implementation of ecological projects.

The USSR Supreme Soviet and Brazilian National Congress deputies expressed satisfaction with positive trends in resolving conflicts in some regions of the world. They believe, however, that hotbeds of tension which still exist on various continents represent a constant source of danger and pose a threat to peace and the peoples' independence and sovereignty. The earliest-possible settlement of regional conflicts by peaceful means on the basis of the UN Charter principles must be achieved, while effectively utilizing the potential of this organization and observing the legal interests of all states and peoples and their right to determine their own future. They attach great importance in this respect to the collective efforts being made, notably through the United Nations, to eliminate regional hotbeds of tension and favor strict adherence to international accords and UN Security Council decisions on settlements regarding Afghanistan, Namibia, and the Iran-Iraq conflict.

The two sides welcomed the positive changes with regard to easing the situation surrounding Cambodia and expressed the hope that they will lead to the creation of conditions for that conflict to be finally resolved.

The parliamentarians supported the proposal to convene an international conference on the Near East under the UN aegis with the participation of all interested parties, including the PLO, and also the five permanent members of the Security Council, in order to achieve a just, comprehensive settlement in the region based on consideration for the legal interests of everyone involved in the conflict.

Discussing the situation in Central America, the Soviet and Brazilian parliamentarians opposed the application of a policy of pressure and interference there, favored Latin American countries' continuing their peacemaking efforts, and confirmed the need to consistently implement in full the Guatemala and El Salvador agreements. In this connection they expressed the belief that a peaceful, just settlement in Central America can only be achieved by taking the legal interests of all Central American countries into account and through the efforts of the Latin American states themselves, on the basis of respect for the sovereign rights of countries in this region and their right to independently choose their path of development.

The USSR Supreme Soviet deputies and members of the Brazilian National Congress noted with satisfaction the ongoing development of friendly bilateral ties and stressed the important significance of deepening Soviet-Brazilian political dialogue and contacts between the two countries' governments, parliaments, and state and social institutions and organizations, which contribute to constructive collaboration between the Soviet Union and Brazil in a spirit of mutual trust and respect. Noting the existence of broad possibilities for the development of Soviet-Brazilian cooperation in various spheres, they confirmed their willingness to further contribute to strengthening equitable, mutually advantageous relations between the two countries. The significance of further increasing trade and economic ties was especially underlined.

The sides favored setting up a permanent Soviet-Brazilian parliamentary group in order to strengthen relations between the Soviet Union and the Federative Republic of Brazil and broaden ties between the two countries.

The USSR Supreme Soviet delegation expressed sincere appreciation to the Brazilian parliamentarians and official authorities for their warm, friendly reception. On behalf of the USSR Supreme Soviet, it invited a delegation of the Brazilian National Congress to come to the Soviet Union on an official visit at a convenient time.

The invitation was accepted with thanks.

[Dated] Brasilia, June 1989.

Political & Social

Supreme Soviet Committees, Commissions Meet

PM2106144589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 21 Jun 89 Morning Edition pp 1-2

[Report by E. Gonzalyez, V. Dolganov, and Ye. Zhbanov: "A Good Beginning Is Half the Job; USSR Supreme Soviet Committees and Commissions Have Set to Work"]

[Text] The Soviet of the Union's Planning, Budget, and Finance Commission had assembled by 1000. They arranged the chairs to suit themselves—they will obviously always sit like that now—and renewed their acquaintance. They stood in line, and brief details were taken—where they have lived, studied, and worked and what field they are in now.

The commission's amalgamated biography was quite motley. The members' ages range from 25 to 60, but most are around 50. Slightly less than half are Russians, next come Ukrainians, Belorussians, Uzbeks, and one representative each of other nationalities, including a Karelian, a Chechen, a Yakut, and even a Greek. Their education level is higher than average, and scientific knowledge goes right up to the level of a corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences. Their posts vary from worker to deputy chairman of a republican council of ministers.

V. Kucherenko, the commission's chairman and for the time being still chairman of the Donetsk Oblast Soviet of People's Deputies, described what they will have to engage in for the next few days—where they must sit and in what numbers and who must be approved for which posts. First on the list of the future cabinet was the post of USSR minister of foreign economic relations.

"I have one absolutely optional suggestion," said V. Kucherenko, still not suspecting how it would end. "We could invite the deputy minister of foreign economic relations to visit us today to put us in the picture about the problems. After all, to be honest, on this specific matter we are not very...[incomplete sentence as published] Incidentally, as far as I know, nothing similar is being suggested in the other commissions."

"So that he can read us a lecture?" one deputy asked thoughtfully. "Or pass on his departmental approach toward problems?" continued another. "But what if that deputy minister is later replaced?" another suggested. "After all the new team is being put together. So if the candidate minister himself, now...."

V. Kucherenko was about to try to withdraw his voluntary suggestion but collective thinking had already started to develop along a very complex spiral. Here is a rough summary.

The deputies have only biographical information about the candidates. They have neither the results of the ministry's activity nor the program of the future leader.

Candidates for posts can be questioned tomorrow at a meeting in the Kremlin. Only there will already be three commissions—150 people—there at the same time. We have to trust Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov. He is forming the cabinet and proposing candidates, he will have to work with them. But among the deputies there are some who disagree in principle with the program proposed by N.I. Ryzhkov, especially for the immediate future.

Whether they agree or not the congress in general has approved it. But can candidates be approved for lofty posts on that basis without going into the details of their activity? Meetings with them in a relatively narrow circle are absolutely essential.

It must be said that the commission chairman did not share this opinion. The deputies suspected him of some "fear of god" and in the interval agreed to "reinforce" their chairman with a strong deputy. They reckoned that N. Petrakov, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, would fit the bill perfectly.

They organized an interval to consult with Ye. Primakov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet's Soviet of the Union.

Academician Ye.M. Primakov led the first sitting of the International Affairs Committee that day. One of the questions examined was the creation of subcommittees: for foreign policy and legal questions; foreign economic, scientific and technical and trade relations; and for humanitarian and cultural relations. These subcommittees have been headed by Academician G. Arbatov, F. Tabeyev, first deputy chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers, and LITERATURNAYA GAZETA political observer F. Burlatskiy.

There was a discussion of the nominations for the leaders of the committee, which will be submitted for approval in the chambers of the Soviet parliament. It is planned to approve the experienced diplomat A. Dzasokhov as coordinator with the rank of deputy chairman. At present he has still not resigned as first secretary of the North Osetian CPSU Oblast Committee. As soon as a worthy replacement is found A. Dzasokhov will set about executing his duties as chairman. So the committee members have decided that the USSR Supreme Soviet will have the final say.

A. Ananyev, the writer and chief editor of the journal OKTYABR, and Ukrainian Foreign Minister V. Kravets have been elected deputy chairmen. The secretary is Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Deputy Foreign Minister N. Neyland.

In the very near future the members of the International Affairs Committee must draft a number of important international documents which must be ratified at the present USSR Supreme Soviet session. During the exchange of opinions the committee members made a very important proposal which fundamentally changes the approach toward the conclusion of international treaties, acts, conventions, and protocols. All these documents must reach the committee for analysis, study, and amplification with the participation of experts not after they have been signed, as used to be the case, but during preparation by the USSR Foreign Ministry.

Perhaps the most serious and most difficult question for the committee members to decide is the professionalization of their work. Who will work permanently in the committee and to whom will the "as a rule" stipulation apply? Virtually every committee member holds a quite high post at present. And to be honest you can understand people who are reluctant to part with the work they love.

The Planning, Budget, and Finance Commission members were back in their seats after a 10-minute break. V. Kucherenko announced that today Ye. Primakov had to attend two sittings in succession and that they would therefore have no assistant. Incidentally, he too sees no great need for preliminary meetings with the candidates. But if the deputies consider it necessary....

And discussion began again—was it necessary or not? Some argued that without it the commission would simply be unable later to fulfill its mission. Deputy G. Filshin spoke particularly activelf and keenly on this point. Others believed that there is no point in "fussing" since the mission itself is still not entirely clear.

But then Deputy V. Gubarev rose and simply said: "The voters have placed a certain responsibility on us as legislators. Unless we transfer a certain part of this responsibility to the executive power, we shall remain with a burden beyond our powers."

A 2-hour interval was announced to clarify the situation, to have contacts with cabinet candidate members, and to organize meetings with them. "But if they refuse..." said V. Kucherenko.

"Then warn them that they will be over 40 votes short," someone advised him.

In the interval the opinion formed in the corridors decided to "reinforce" the commission chairman with a powerful secretary. They believed that F. Gilshin would cope perfectly well with the matter.

Not long before the first sitting of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Questions of Legislation, Legality, and Law and Order, we had a brief conversation in the corridor, as they say, with USSR People's Deputy Yu. Kalmykov. He is a doctor of juridical sciences, a professor, and head of the Saratov Legal Institute civil law department. We wondered how he sees the committee's practical steps.

"To be frank, even recently the quality of the new normative acts had not only failed to improve but had declined and many norms contradict each other, have only a weak link with the realities of life, and are sometimes simply absurd. That applies to the law on the enterprise, on the cooperative movement, and on individual labor activity.... A most thorough reworking of existing legislation is required. But above all, of course, we must draft the laws stipulated by the congress. For instance, on the status of the USSR people's deputy."

"And what after that?"

"First of all, although it may not seem a priority to broad circles, I personally consider a law on the law to be absolutely urgent. That is not a tautology. It is a case of a strict procedure for creating legislative acts. At present, forgive me, anyone who feels like it engages in lawmaking. Legal scholars are enlisted to draft a law only at the first stage but after that it wanders round various instances and as a result the text is unrecognizable... But we should determine precisely who has the right of legislative initiative and determine the number of hearings of a draft law and who takes part in the discussion. The final stage is examination by an authoritative expert organ such as our committee is intended to become. In addition it is extremely important to create a legal fast reaction mechanism, so to speak, so that if any loopholes or inaccuracies are discovered in a law they do not take many years to correct."

Naturally, the first sitting—it was led by Ye.M. Primakov since the committee's chairman, S.S. Alekseyev, was absent through illness—could not immediately be devoted to legislative problems. Organizational questions were decided. Following a proposal submitted in the name of S. Alekseyev, Yu.Kh. Kalmykov (our talk with him was a happy coincidence) was elected deputy chairman of the committee and B.I. Semenko, chairman of the Ivanovo Oblast Court, was elected secretary. The creation of four subcommittees did not generate any objections.

That in general exhausted the agenda. But an unexpected statement was made by Tsyren Nimbuyev, who honestly admitted that he has no idea about laws because he is an agrarian expert and asked for Ye. Primakov's assistance in transferring him to a commission or committee closer to the problems of arable farming. The statement was greeted with understanding. But that is only a small detail. On the democratic wave of the congress, it was the desire to work and not sit idly by which literally "worked up" the gathering when the work plan for the next few days was issued. At a joint sitting with the Supreme Soviet Committee for Questions of Glasnost and Citizens' Rights and Appeals, they had to examine the

composition of the USSR Supreme Court and candidacies for various posts. Deputy Yu.Yu. Sorochik spoke and expressed perplexity: Why had brief accounts of each candidacy not been attached in advance to the list of Supreme Court members? "I am not a lawyer and I must consult with the voters to know who's who." Deputy S.A. Medvedyev put the question more keenly: The events in Fergana have shown yet again how complex the situation in the country is. What happened there? We did not receive a full explanation. That is why we must carefully study the nomination for the post of internal affairs minister before recommending him to the Supreme Soviet. The candidate should submit his program of actions to us beforehand.

The leitmotif of the statements by deputies R.A. Medvedyev, A.M. Yakovlev, and R.Kh. Solntsev was concern over how to really restore and raise the prestige of the law enforcement organs.

As the first sitting ended one deputy joked: "Never mind, that was just the knock-up."

Meanwhile the Planning, Budget, and Finance Commission had embarked on the election of the deputy chairman and secretary. Despite the talk in the corridor beforehand N. Petrakov and G. Filshin had to set forth their platforms and concepts for restructuring planning and budget and financial matters. Incidentally, both were able to demonstrate within 10 minutes not only a knowledge of economic problems but also their own approach toward their solution.

The commission chairman, his deputy, the secretary, and several other deputies—the so-called initiative group—then spent a great deal longer discussing the directions of the forthcoming work, the composition of the subcommissions, and other as yet unclear business.

Chazov Approved as Health Minister

LD2106141789 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 21 Jun 89

[Text] For the 2d day, deputies of the USSR Supreme Soviet have been examining and discussing issues related to the individual composition of the USSR Government. Here is our special correspondent Igor Zorin.

[Zorin] Good afternoon, esteemed comrades. Since 0900 [0500 GMT], in the conference hall of the chambers of the USSR Supreme Soviet, four interchamber committees of the Supreme Soviet have been discussing for 3 and ½ hours the candidacy of Yevgeniy Ivanovich Chazov put forward for the post of the USSR minister of health. The Committee for the Protection of the People's Health, the Committee on the Affairs of Women and of Family, Mother, and Child Protection, the Committee on Affairs of Veterans and Invalids, and the Committee on Questions of Ecology and the Rational Use of Natural Resources took part in the discussion.

Aleksandra Pavlovna Biryukova, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers Bureau for Social Development, presented the candidacy of Chazov to the deputies. She singled out, in particular, his highly enterprising nature and his endeavoring to improve in every possible way the work of our health care. For example, a program for setting up 150 diagnostic centers in the country has been developed, and 8 of them are already operating. His great organizational work was noted during the operations aimed at eliminating the consequences of the Armenian earthquake and the disaster in the Ufa region. His international standing as a cochairman of the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclwar War organization is high, too. Concluding the presentation of Comrade Chazov's candidacy, Aleksandra Pavlovna Biryukova wished him to pay more attention to introducing scientific and technical advances into practical medicine.

Then for over 2 hours deputies asked Comrade Chazov various questions, and the candidate to the post of health minister in the new government gave open and exhaustive answers to them. He noted that in his capacity as minister, he had failed to break the stereotypes of thinking and work of the medium link of the Soviet medical bodies over 2 years. But as speakers from the four committees stressed, it was precisely under Chazov that an improvement in the activity and the work of the USSR Health Ministry took shape over a brief period.

What else should be mentioned? Deputies again raised the issue of the excellent medical services provided by the establishments of the Fourth Main Directorate, and the mediocre or sometimes downright bad services in the establishments of people's health care. Chazov said that only 2 hospitals with 1,600 beds in Kuntsevo, and 2 polyclinics, belong to the Fourth Main Directorate, whereas over 200,000 establishments belong to the country's health care system, and it is not that simple to improve their work. The USSR Health Ministry will, however, strive to attain this goal, the more so as there are precedents, Chazov said. In his view, the hospitals and polyclincs of many establishments and industrial enterprises of the country even surpass the medical establishments of the Fourth Main Directorate in some aspects. Deputy Pukhova touched upon the issue of medical certificates and the problems of pregnancy and abortions in the country. Chazov noted that over the last year an improvement in the social position of women in the country has taken shape, making it possible to reduce the number of abortions by 500,000. Moreover, last year over 1 million mini-abortions were carried out, and this allowed all women to remain fertile.

In a word, there were many questions, which were followed by discussion of Comrade Chazov's candidacy. Deputies criticized the USSR Health Ministry for its passivity in solving the problems linked to the Chernobyl

accident and other points. However, when Chazov's candidacy was put to the vote, most of the deputies were in favor of him; there were four against, and several abstentions.

Then Comrade Biryukova presented Marat Vladimirovich Gramov as a candidate for the post of chairman of the USSR State Committee for Sport at a joint session of the Committee on Public Health and the Committee on Youth Affairs. I have been listening to and analyzing the answers to questions and speeches by the two candidates for USSR ministers, and I will say frankly that Comrade Chazov passed his exam before the deputies with the highest mark. At the same time, Comrade Gramov's answers—and he is still answering questions—do not bring anything but disappointment. Deputies themselves noted that those were answers not of a specialist in his field, but of a functionary. Chazov sees and knows how to solve problems, whereas the candidate to the post of chairman of the USSR State Committee for Sport said little in a constructive and concrete manner. The many-hours long procedure of discussing Comrade Gramov's candidacy is still continuing.

Georgian Commission on 9 Apr Tbilisi Events Meets

'Special Commission' Organized

PM1606145989 Tbilisi ZARYA VOSTOKA in Russian 7 Jun 89 p 3

[GRUZINFORM report: "In the Georgian SSR Supreme Soviet Commission"]

[Text] The Georgian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet commission to investigate the circumstances which occurred 9 April 1989 in Tbilisi is continuing its work. Researching, analyzing, and generalizing all aspects of what happened, it is preparing appropriate conclusions and recreating the real picture of that April night. The documents and material collected "hot on the heels" of the tragedy will help the commission specially set up by the Congress of USSR People's Deputies to objectively analyze the essence of what happened.

A routine session of the commission heard a report on the preliminary conclusion of the investigative subcommission, delivered by its leader, Professor Tengiz Liluashvili, doctor of juridical sciences. According to the decision which was adopted, the text of the conclusion has been sent to Moscow to the Congress of USSR People's Deputies and the deputies from the Georgian SSR and will be published in the republican press.

In connection with statements made by the collectives of a number of medical establishments and organizations, and also an appeal by Georgian mothers and Red Cross activists published in the newspaper AKHALGAZRDA KOMUNISTI 30 May this year regarding the passivity demonstrated by the Georgian SSR Red Cross Society leadership in giving prompt and efficient help to the victims and with certain statements concerning the mass poisoning which took place in Tbilisi, the commission heard explanations from Svetlana Amiridze, chairman of the society's Central Committee. During the discussion which took place, it was admitted that the facts cited in the statements and the appeal had mostly been confirmed, and in this connection the commission raised the question of S. Amiridze's unsuitability as chairman of the Georgian SSR Red Cross Society Central Committee.

Wolfgang Fricke and Juergen Doering, doctors from the FRG who are in Tbilisi, were invited to the commission session and reported on the progress of their examination of those who have suffered from the effects of chemical toxins. Noting that medical treatment is being carried out in an organized fashion and correctly, they stressed the need to continue it.

Explanations connected with the incident which took place 18 February this year near the Georgian Polytechnical Institute were given to the commission by its rector, Gocha Chogovadze, corresponding member of the republic's Academy of Sciences. Since the reasons, means, and methods of putting a stop to the youth rally outside the institute may to a certain degree also throw light on the tragedy which took place 9 April near Government House, a special commission made up of [main] commission members was set up to examine thoroughly the circumstances connected with the 18 February events. USSR People's Deputy Parmen Margvelashvili was elected its chairman.

Commission's 'Preliminary Findings'

PM2106151189 Tbilisi ZARYA VOSTOKA in Russian 11 Jun 89 p 4

["Preliminary Findings of the Georgian Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet Commission Subcommission for the Investigation of the Circumstances of the 9 April 1989 Tbilisi Events"]

[Text] I.

Subunits of the Soviet Army and Internal Forces which were directly involved in the tragedy of 9 April 1989 in Tbilisi are sticking to their account of the events, which can be summed up as follows: Subunits of the Soviet Army and Internal Forces were sent to Tbilisi to give fraternal assistance to the Georgian people. Georgian extremists had put forward anti-Soviet demands; they wanted to topple Georgia's lawful government and take power into their own hands. There was a real danger that vital republic installations would be seized. Anti-Russian slogans were raised, and groups of well-trained and organized people called at enterprises and stopped hundreds and thousands of people from working; they overturned buses, broke windows, and sowed confusion and discord. When at 0400 troop units arrived in the square, they saw in front of the Government House injured and bleeding women being carried by Georgians. The women appealed to the soldiers for help but the demonstrators

made it impossible for the soldiers to save them. Some extremists wore gas masks or gauze face masks and carried aerosol cans and cans containing "dikhlofos." The servicemen met with fierce resistance: They were beaten, and sticks, bottles, and anything that came to hand were thrown at them. As a result several dozen soldiers were maimed.

If one is to believe Soviet Army and Internal Forces leaders, the women died at the hands of the Georgian extremists, and the men's deaths were caused by the resistance of the soldiers who were under attack. It was the extremists rather than the troops who used toxic chemicals.

The question arises: Why do they need such a cynical and false account?

They need it in order, first, to justify—somehow at least—the use of arms (for arms read firearms as well as blade weapons, and especially sharpened sappers' shovels, and toxic chemicals). The point is that if no one had attacked the citizens and the demonstrators had not wanted to topple the governement by means of force, the troop subunits would have had no right to resort to the use of weapons—as will be explained in detail later. And second, they need it in order to sidestep responsibility for a whole series of crimes including the use of toxic chemicals.

All this will be discussed in greater detail later.

II. The Factual Side of the 9 April Events

With a view to investigating and establishing the circumstances of the 9 April tragedy, the investigatory subcommission has collected hundreds of statements from people who directly took part in the rally, hunger strikers, and the Ministry of Internal Affairs [MVD] organ staffers who were on duty there on the instructions of the said organs, and it also gathered material evidence. The conclusions reached by the chemical and toxicological and the medical subcommissions were also submitted to the investigatory subcommission.

The following gave explanations at the commission session: Sh. Gorgodze, Georgian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] minister of internal affairs; R. Gventsadze, chief of the Tbilisi internal affairs administration; V. Razmadze, Georgian SSR prosecutor; V. Sharashe, Georgian SSR minister of justice; Major General V. Vasilyev, USSR deputy chief military prosecutor; O. Cherkeziya, chairman of the Georgian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; N. Popkhadze, secretary of the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee; Dzh. Patiashvili, former first secretary of the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee; and Z. Chkheidze, former chairman of the Georgian SSR Council of Ministers.

As a result of the analysis and evaluation of the collected material, the investigatory subcommission deems that the following circumstances have been established:

1. The participants in the 9 April 1989 rally demanded that the Georgian SSR withdraw from the USSR and that Georgia's independence, lost in 1921, be restored.

This was a specific demand whose implementation was sought by the rally participants.

2. In order to express this political demand, the demonstrators chose an entirely peaceful method—a hunger strike.

3. The hunger strike took place in parallel with rallies. Therefore, in addition to the hunger strikers, there were also citizens in the square in front of Government House who were holding rallies from time to time in support of the demands that were put forward.

4. As the republic leadership failed to respond to the demands of the hunger strikers and rally participants, a strike movement started in the city, which led to stoppages or partial suspension of operations at certain enterprises.

5. Apart from these specific demands, extreme slogans were also proclaimed on the lines of "Down with the communist regime!," "Down with Russian imperialism!," "The USSR is the peoples' prison," and so forth.

The investigatory commission takes the view that these and other similar slogans did not represent demands. They were merely value judgments. Therefore, in the given situation, it is very important to distinguish between the demands for whose implementation the hunger strike was declared, and the slogans which were merely value judgments on the part of the rally participants and did not amount to a call for action. In addition, it is completely wrong, impermissible, and totally unacceptable when the proclamation of anti-Soviet slogans is interpreted as an attempt to fan anti-Russian sentiments, and when a rally at which such slogans are proclaimed is declared a nonpeaceful rally.

6. The rally participants not only did not use force, but did themselves try to prevent actions which could, directly or indirectly, be interpreted as a potential use of force. Internal affairs organ staffers have confirmed that no actions on the part of rally participants were observed which would indicate the intention to resort to the use of force. This was also confirmed by Z. Chkheidze, the former chairman of the Georgian SSR Council of Ministers.

7. On 8 April 1989, units of the Soviet Army and USSR MVD Internal Forces entered Tbilisi. On the same day tanks and armored personnel carriers rolled down Rustaveli Boulevard and other streets in the city. This

exacerbated the atmosphere and led in particular to a sharp increase in the number of citizens gathered in the square in front of Government House.

8. On 9 April at 0400, subunits of the Soviet Army and Internal Forces under the leadership of Colonel General I.N. Rodionov, commander of the Transcaucasus Military District, surrounded the hunger strikers and demonstrators and without any warning began an armed assault against them using billy clubs, sharpened sappers' shovels, toxic chemicals, and, in some cases, firearms.

9. As a result of this assault, according to official data, 20 people perished and more than 4,000 people were maimed, poisoned by chemical substances, or otherwise incapacitated.

10. After this tragedy, on the same day, 9 April, a curfew was introduced at 2300, of which the population was notified via Tbilisi television at 2256, that is, 4 minutes before the curfew came into force.

III. Legal Assessment of the 9 April Events

Analysis of the circumstances of the 9 April events and the legal determination of their nature gives us every reason to draw the conclusion that the introduction of the subunits of the Soviet Army and USSR MVD Internal Forces with the aim of dispersing demonstrators resulted in the commission of crimes of a diverse nature and content, of which the following are the most serious:

a) the introduction, in violation of the law, of subunits of the Soviet Army to disperse demonstrators without the declaration of martial law or a state of emergency, which resulted in the death of many people and serious damage to the health of thousands of others;

b) the use of weapons by subunits of the Soviet Army and Internal Forces in circumstances proscribed by law, which led to serious consequences;

c) the use of chemical weapons banned by law which led to the mass poisoning of people;

d) commission of a crime against Georgian SSR MVD organ staffers who were discharging their duty to protect public order at the site of the rally; and

e) commission of crimes against individual citizens.

In order to substantiate the enumerated crimes let us examine them individually.

11. In accordance with Article 119, point 14, of the USSR Constitution, "The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium shall...in the interests of the defense of the USSR and of the security of its citizens, proclaim martial law or a state of emergency throughout the country, or in particular localities, after mandatory examination of this issue with the Supreme Soviet Presidium of the union republic in question."

The Transcaucasus Military District command, and specifically Colonel General I.N. Rodionov, introduced troop units into the city, occupying it in actual fact, without a decree to this effect having been adopted by the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

In this way I. Rodionov crudely violated the Fundamental Law of the USSR, thus assuming powers which are the exclusive prerogative of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium. This entailed serious consequences not only from the viewpoint of the loss of human lives, injuries, and poisoning, but also from the moral and political viewpoint. This undoubtedly raises the question of responsibility for exceeding one's authority or official powers when this has entailed serious consequences. For instance, this action contains elements of the crimes dealt with in Articles 80 and 278 of the Criminal Code of the Georgian SSR.

12. The explanations given by Dzh. Patiashvili, former first secretary of the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee, and some other Bureau members, have confirmed that Army General K. Kochetov, USSR first deputy defense minister, was in Tbilisi in the days preceding 9 April. He attended sessions where the dispersal of the rally was dicussed. This indicates beyond doubt that the USSR Ministry of Defense was well aware of the intention to use the Armed Forces to disperse the rally, despite the fact that without a corresponding decree of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, the USSR Ministry of Defense was not authorized to use subunits of the Armed Forces for this purpose.

13. On 28 July 1988 the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium adopted a Decree "On the Obligations and Rights of USSR MVD Internal Forces in the Maintenance of Public Order."

This decree specifies that internal forces (not subunits of the Soviet Army) can be used to protect public order.

The use of internal forces for this purpose is effected at the decision of the USSR minister of internal affairs, and, in special circumstances, after coordination with the USSR Council of Ministers.

Consequently, it was possible for these troops to enter Tbilisi 8 April only on the decision of the USSR minister of internal affairs.

14. According to a statement of Dzh. Patiashvili, former first secretary of the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee, he cabled an encoded message to the CPSU Central Committee about the introduction of troops in Tbilisi with a view to their dispersing the demonstrators. The message was read out at the Congress of People's Deputies. He also stated that prior to 9 April he had on more than one occasion discussed the situation which had developed in Georgia with some CPSU Central Committee leaders.

The republic leadership knew about the involvement and introduction of Soviet Army and Internal Forces subunits into Tbilisi. The only thing it did not know was the exact time when the dispersal would begin and the types of weapons that would be used. The promises given at the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau session by Army General K. Kochetov and Colonel General I. Rodinov that only shields and billy clubs would be used during the dispersal, and their assurances that not a hair on the heads of the demonstrators and the hunger strikes would be touched, proved to be a cruel deception.

15. The aforementioned decree of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium of 28 July 1988 contains an exhaustive list of the circumstances in which internal forces may use weapons. The purpose of this list is to totally rule out the possibility of weapons being used at the discretion of the troop subunits' command.

Under what circumstances is the use of weapons permitted?

Internal forces personnel are authorized to use weapons under the following exceptional circumstances, as an extreme measure in the discharge of its duties:

a) in order to protect citizens from an attack that threatens their lives or health when all other means and methods have been exhausted;
b) to repel an attack on installations operating under special conditions or other important installations, and also to repel an armed attack on guarded installations;
c) to repel an attack on militiamen, people's volunteer squads, and servicemen when their lives are in immediate danger;
d) to detain a person who has committed a crime and is putting up armed resistance, or has been caught committing an especially dangerous crime when it is impossible to detain such people by other means.

This is the exhaustive list of circumstances in which the use of weapons is authorized. In all other circumstances internal forces must ensure the maintenance of public order without the use of weapons.

As you can see, none of the circumstances mentioned above applied in Tbilisi 9 April.

Consequently one of the most important tenets of the decree cited above was violated, and the use of weapons ensued in cases forbidden by the decree. But the angriest condemnation is prompted by the use of a toxic chemical, namely CS (K-51), and certain other toxic substances, the composition of which is in the process of being determined. It is important to note that the use of such substances is banned even in cases where the use of weapons is permitted by legislation.

It was these violations, taken together, which led to deaths and to sickness for more than 4,000 people, the treatment of which entails many difficulties, and the consequences of which are not yet known. It was the complications in treatment that gave rise to the invitation of representatives of the International Red Cross, as well as doctors and toxicologists from foreign countries.

Consequently this is an action that contains elements of deliberate murder carried out with particular cruelty and by a method dangerous to the lives of many people.

In his speech on Central Television Lieutenant Colonel I.N. Rodionov noted that the Army did not use chemical agents, because it did not have any. According to him, the internal forces used chemical agents with an irritant lachrimatory effect.

It is common knowledge today that not only lachrimatory chemical agents were used, but also a powerful toxic substance, CS, that is, K-51, as well as other toxic substances, the use of which is not permitted by Soviet legislation. If you believe I. Rodionov, the only person who could have given the order for the use of banned chemical weapons was the commander of the subunits of internal forces that were sent into Tbilisi to disperse the demonstrators—Major General Yefimov. Thus on the basis of I. Rodionov's statement it is on him that the responsibility for the aforementioned crime should rest.

16. It must also be noted that according to the aforementioned USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium Decree of 28 July 1988, "it is prohibited to use weapons...against women and juveniles, with the exception of instances of armed attack on their part." However, of the 20 innocent people killed in Tbilisi City on 9 April, 16 were women, and the majority of those maimed and poisoned were young girls.

Thus the commanding officers who led the operation to disperse the rally in effect made a fiction of the provision, set forth in Article 1 of the decree, that "the internal forces of the USSR MVD are guided in their activity by USSR legislative acts, the USSR Armed Forces general troop regulations, the present decree, and USSR Council of Ministers resolutions."

17. Particular mention should be made of the crime committed against Georgian SSR MVD employees on 9 April. As on the previous days, on the instructions of the appropriate organs, militia details were posted in the square in front of Government House. It is now common knowledge that thanks to their selfless actions many hundreds of lives were saved.

Precisely because they were rescuing people who were in a helpless state, the soldiers and their commanding officers had no mercy on the militia employees: Many of them were seriously injured and went into the hospital, where some of them remain to this day.

At the same time, according to Point 6 of the aforementioned USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium Decree of 28 July 1988, the internal forces are obliged to assist militia

employees when they are under attack. Yet despite this instruction, the internal forces, together with Army subunits, attacked militia employees and beat them mercilessly solely because they were trying to help the victims and take them to the ambulances.

Thus here there are elements of a crime covered by Georgian SSR criminal legislation, namely attempts on the life of militia employees in the course of the execution of their official duties.

18. The injury to citizen D.I. Pailodze is evidence confirming that not only sharpened sapper shovels and banned chemical weapons, but also firearms were used on 9 April. While running away from the square in front of Government House, he was seriusly wounded in the head by firearms, as a result of which he lost both eyes. This is attempted murder. The case is being investigated by the military prosecutor's office.

19. The tyrannical actions of the troop units went so far that they started shooting without reason at children playing in the street. At around 1815 on 9 April, that is, before the imposition of the curfew, near the "Batumi" movie theater, they began to shoot at playing children without any reason whatsoever, and wounded 15-year-old D. Mkhatvrishvili in the leg. Seeing this, the 12-year-old boy L. Chanadiri, who was nearby, was frightened, and jumped onto his bicycle to flee. But at that moment an officer shot him with a firearm and wounded him in the buttocks. The boy is still undergoing treatment in the hospital. It should be noted that despite the serious bleeding that started in the child, the servicemen did not allow people to approach him, threatening them with submachineguns. Help could only be given after the column of servicemen had passed.

Consequently, this is attempted murder of juveniles, although Soviet legislation bans the use of firearms against juveniles, with the exception of cases of armed attack by them (Article 6 of the aforementioned USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium Decree of 28 July 1988).

20. A serious infringement was committed on 17 April 1989 during an inspection of the premises of the Tbilisi Theater Institute. A check was carried out by military specialists because instances of the poisoning of students and staff had been observed there. The inspection was carried out by Major General A.N. Burkov, commander of chemical troops of the Transcaucasus Military District; Lieutenant A.Yu. Ligin, assistant chief for the collection and processing of data; and Major of Medical Services V.G. Sadyuk, chief of the department of toxicology and radiology; their attention was drawn to their responsibility. Representatives of the military prosecutor's office took part in the investigation operation.

As a result of the inspection they concluded that the premises were not contaminated with CS, choroacetophenone, or other toxic chemicals.

Their findings were drawn up on 17 April 1989, and after that date dozens of students and staff were poisoned in the Theater Institute premises.

It was therefore necessary to carry out a second inspection, which was entrusted to a laboratory of the Georgian SSR Ministry of Health. On 28 April 1989 the laboratory detected the presence of chloroacetophenone and other toxic substances in the institute's premises. As a result it was deemed necessary to suspend studies at the institute until after decontamination of the premises.

21. What happened in Tbilisi on 9 April is without precedent: We know of no other case where the state has used toxic chemicals against its own citizens and where the names and composition of these chemicals have been concealed from medical personnel by the military authorities, which hampers the effective treatment of the sick.

22. Even in the history of war, it is rare to find cases of a surrounded enemy not being asked to lay down its arms and surrender, and allowed time to consider this. That is the unwritten law of war. Unfortunately, for reasons that are not at all clear, nothing of the kind happened on 9 April. The hunger strikers and demonstrators were encircled and the slaughter began without any prior warning or official announcement.

Added to this is the fact of the categorical denial by representatives of the Soviet Army and internal forces of the use of any toxic chemicals, although hundreds of people were taken to the hospitals wth symptoms of acute poisoning by unknown chemicals. The speech by Colonel General I. Rodionov on Central Television on 20 April 1989 is characteristic in this respect. Twenty days after the tragedy he admitted the use of tear gases, but concealed from the public and made no mention of the use of CS or K-51—a banned toxic chemical that is extremely dangerous to human life—or of a number of other toxic substances.

All these facts provide every reason to conclude that the actions of subunits of the internal forces and the Soviet Army were not aimed at dispersing the rally. This was not their objective; otherwise a different plan of action would have been chosen.

Everything suggests clearly that the objective was not to disperse the demonstrators, but to carry out a punitive operation. This is reliably attested by the fact that the demonstrators were given no opportunity to flee, while militia workers, doctors, and medical orderlies were beaten up with sticks and sapper shovels solely because they were helping people who were unable to move by themselves because of the wounds and poisoning they had sustained.

IV. Sociopolitical Assessment of the 9 April Events

Among the events that seriously retard restructuring and democratization, a special place belongs to the 9 April tragedy, a political assessment of which provides grounds for the following conclusions:

23. Tyranny on the part of officials, which became widespread under the conditions of totalitarianism and autocratic power, still occurs today. They do not consider themselves bound by legal or other social norms, they do not regard laws and other normative acts as binding on them, and they control social processes according to their own subjective inclination, without studying the essence and causes of the emergence of political, economic, social, or other problems that arise.

24. The inertia of Stalinist thinking, whereby anti-Soviet slogans are regarded as a far more serious crime than any crime against the individual, is still strong. The ideology of the preservation of the existing regime at all costs effectively repudiates the provision enshrined in the Constitution that the USSR is a voluntary union of free republics. The champions of this ideology regard it as the gravest state crime for any union republic even to form the intention of using the right granted by the Constitution to free secession from the USSR. They believe that a citizen can be punished for expressing this idea, and that if the mass expresses the same idea, you can resort to a mass rout, as was done in Tbilisi on 9 April.

It was this that was the main motive for the crime committed in Tbilisi.

25. As for the position of the Georgian SSR leadership, two more factors apparently operated here, in addition to the aforementioned defect in the way of thinking: First, the upsurge in the national movement potentially contained and contains the possibility of social slogans being put forward, in particular protests against the bribery and other forms of corruption that are so widespread, and in whose grip the Georgian people are stifling today. Such a barbarous suppression of the national movement, in the view of corrupt elements, should also have suppressed the struggle for social justice, and conseqeuntly preserved all the conditions under which unlawful or unearned income can be obtained; second, there is fear, the constant companion of corrupt elements. They are constantly afraid of exposure and punishment. This forces them to fulfill not only the lawful, but also the unlawful wishes of those on whom their fate in practice depends. Clearly, for this reason they lack the capability to defend Georgia's interests against higher bodies.

It is mainly these two motives that explain the crime committed by the republic leadership against the Georgian people, which took the form of bringing in forces from outside to take reprisals against a peaceful rally. This step was carried out by the Georgian leaders by means of a written request to the CPSU Central Committee for military assistance. Although this appeal has no legal force, since the use of the Army does not come within the competence of the CPSU Central Committee, this does not attenuate the guilt of the republic leaders.

26. Democracy and the free expression of thought is the only way to eradicate everything that could harm our people.

Therefore every democratic movement, including demonstrations and rallies, not only should not be suppressed, but, to the contrary, must be developed in every way, given a sense of purpose, and used in order to achieve socially useful goals and promote the renewal and transformation of society.

Therefore particular attention should be paid to improving the rules for the conduct of rallies and demonstrations. These rules should be publicly discussed again and perfected, and after that, strictly observed. The holding of rallies and demonstrations in compliance with the procedure laid down, as happens in all the democratic countries of the world, is a most important condition for the effective implementation of the people's demands.

27. Interethnic relations need to be improved. We speak very frequently about Stalinist tyranny and totalitarianism, but we very rarely rectify the mistakes made by Stalin. After all, Stalin in effect abolished the federation, and created a unitary state in the place of the federal state.

Here the question that arises first and foremost is that of repealing the 1922 Treaty on the Creation of the USSR and concluding a new, improved treaty. The present treaty, adopted more than 70 years ago, does not stand up to criticism. The republics should be granted the right autonomously to formulate their own social, economic, and demographic policy and measures for its implementation.

[Signed] Tengiz Liluashvili,

Chairman of the investigation subcommission, doctor of legal sciences

[Editorial note] We ask readers to put forward their own ideas and observations, which will be taken into account in the compilation of the final and full findings of the investigation subcommission.

The preliminary findings were examined and approved by the Georgian SSR Supreme Soviet commission for the investigation of the circumstances that occurred on 9 April 1989 in the city of Tbilisi (Protocol No 8, 2 June 1989).

Further Information on Novyy Uzen Disturbances

'Extremists' Kindling Conflict

LD2006165989 Alma-Ata Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 20 Jun 89

[Text] In order to stop the disorders which have arisen in Novyy Uzen, the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet Presidium on 19 June made the decision to introduce a curfew in the town. It operates from 2100 to 0600 local time. It is forbidden at any time of the day of night in any place to hold meetings, demonstrations, or large-scale gatherings, or to keep firearms in apartments and public places. Movement through the town at night is only allowed with special passes. Knayazev, minister of internal affairs of the Kazakh SSR, lieutenant general of the internal service, has been appointed commandant of the town.

The situation in the town is gradually returning to normal. The operational headquarters set up there has managed to cool to some extent the passions inflamed by criminal elements. Industrial enterprises are working normally. Many shops have opened. Traffic is flowing again on a number of passenger routes. However, unsanctioned demonstrations and meetings, and skirmishes between opposing groups of hooligans and their suporters are still continuing in various areas of Novyy Uzen.

According to the available data, 27 people applied for medical assistance by the 20 June. Three participants in the clashes—two Kazakh and one Lezgin—have died from wounds received during the clashes. During the disorders no little material damage was caused: 59 commercial and consumer service permises were damaged; five state and private cars were burned; a liquor shop was looted; and windows were smashed in many administrative and residential buildings, cinemas and hostels.

The law enforcement bodies are striving to expose and isloate the instigators and active participants in the disorders as quickly as possible; 42 people have been detained. At the same time, organizational work is being stepped up by representatives of party, local soviet and Komsomol organs in the republic and in Gurev Oblast, and by USSR people's deputies, the creative intelligentsia, and veterans of war and labor, to return life in Novyy Uzen to its normal course and to neutralize the spread of rumors directed at exacerbating interethnic relations.

However, the stabilization of the situation in the town is being hampered to a large extent by extremists who are not desisting from attempts to further kindle conflicts on the basis of nationality and to alienate the population from the law-enforcement organs. Urban radio loudspeakers are constantly heard during these alarming days. They have been set up on telegraph poles and motor vehicles. Calls and appeals for calm, reason, and restraint are being broadcast at short intervals. However, the hearts of many people of Novyy Uzen are inflamed at what has happened; they must, they are obliged to respond. Not for nothing do they say in the east that the way to personal happiness via the unhappiness and pain of another loses itself in the desert.

Reasons for Disturbances Listed

LD2106151289 Moscow TASS in English 1408 GMT 21 Jun 89

[Text] Novyy Uzen June 21 TASS—By TASS correspondent Raisa Ioffe:

Prompt measures adopted in Kazakhstan's Guryev region have eased tension in the town of Novyy Uzen with no more casualties reported.

A total of more than fifty law-enforcement officers were wounded in the latest flare-up of disturbances in the USSR's Asian part.

The night of June 21 was calm: no acts of hooliganism or clashes between warring groups or individuals were reported.

At the same time, 67 people were detained in one night for violating curfew regulations imposed by a decree of the presidium of the Kazakhstan Supreme Soviet. As their identities were established, the persons were released.

Regrettably conflict spilt over to nearby settlements. In clashes between groups of residents in one of them, comprising people of different nationalities, two people were injured. Four participants in the clashes have been detained. The order has been restored.

In connection with the disorders, many people, chiefly women and children, are leaving Novyy Uzen. 528 people have left for cities in the northern Caucasus.

Some are inclined to ascribe the causes of the conflict to differences between Novyy Uzen residents of different nationalities. It would be superficial and simplistic to make this conclusion.

The causes are many: difficulties that have emerged in the course of the social and economic development of the town in the desert.

Problems in housing construction, trade and consumer services, food supply and job opportunities for graduates of educational establishments had accumulated for years.

The infrastructure is underdeveloped, and there are objective difficulties of a natural and climatic character that sleazy dealers and swindlers of all sorts used for their advantage.

Black marketeering began to prosper, abuses in trading and consumer services systems increased. And to crown it al, local authorities failed to adopt proper measures to resolve all these outstanding issues.

Alma-Ata Radio Describes Situation

LD2106164589 Alma-Ata Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 21 Jun 89

[Excerpts] Novyy Uzen—The situation is returning to normal. As has already been reported, by decision of the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet Presidium, with the aim of stopping the disorders in Novyy Uzen, a curfew was introduced on 19 of June. The night of 20-21 June passed peacefully in the town. There were no hooligan actions or clashes, either of opposing groups or of individual persons. At the same time, for violating the curfew regime—it operates from 2100 to 0600 local time—67 people were arrested in the night. They, and the seven drivers of cars which were stopped, did not have special passes and documents. After explaining the reasons for their activity, they were sent home.

Unfortunately, the Novyy Uzen conflict has spilled over into nearby villages. Thus in the village of (Monayshyr) there was a clash between groups of residents of different nationalities, during which two people were injured. Four of the participants were detained. Order has been restored in (Monayshyr).

In the village of (Lytybay) on the night of 20-21 June there was a spontaneous meeting, after which people went home. However, during the day about 500 people once again gathered in the village center.

In connection with the disorders which have arisen, many residents, basically women and children, are leaving Novyy Uzen: 328 people have left for Makhachkala and 300 for Groznyy. [passage omitted]

Naturally, all of this has caused justified indignation among the Novyy Uzen population, and then on the night of 16 June the hot points of dissatisfaction were set alight by hooligan thugs during a fight on a dance floor. After that the conflict spread on the 17-18 of June. More and more people were involved in it, which was the reason for the introduction on 19 June of internal troops into the town and the proclamation of the curfew. These timely measures have allowed a cooling of passions in Novyy Uzen. There are no new deaths. Over 50 law-enforcement officers were hurt during the disorders.

Baku Radio Reports on Novyy Uzen

NC2206085789 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 1600 GMT 21 Jun 89

[Text] Here is a report from Guryev Oblast:

The Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet Presidium, acting with the intention of preventing disturbances, decided to impose a curfew in Novyy Uzen in Guryev Oblast on 19 June. The curfew will be in effect from 2100 to 0600 local time. In view of this, demonstrations, mass meetings, and possession of firearms in houses and in public are completely banned. Only individuals with special permits will be allowed to travel in the city during the night. Lieutenant General Knayazev, who is also the minister of internal affairs of the Kazakh SSR, has been appointed as the commandant of the city.

The situation in the city is gradually returning to normal. The operative headquarters, which has been set up in the city, is [words indistinct] the disturbances provoked by criminal elements. Industries are operating normally. Many of the shops are now open. A number of passenger (?vehicles) have resumed work. However, unauthorized demonstrations and [word indistinct] and clashes between opposing groups of hooligans and their supporters in Novyy Uzen and in [word indistinct] and other rayons are continuing.

It has been reported that 25 people have requested medical treatment until 20 July. Three of the individuals who participated in the clashes [words indistinct] died as a result of their wounds.

The clashes caused significant material damage. A total of 59 trade and livelihood services installations were damaged, five state-owned and private cars were set on fire, the Sharaf [word indistinct] shop was smashed, and the windows of many administrative and residential buildings, movie theaters, and boarding houses were broken.

The law enforcement agencies are trying to establish the identities of and to (?arrest) the individuals who attempt to cause disturbances and who actively take part in them as soon as possible. Forty-two people have been arrested. Meanwhile, the organizational work carried out by the representatives of the republic's and Guryev Oblast's party, soviet, and Leninist Communist Youth League organs, USSR people's deputies, creative intellectuals, and war and work veterans to normalize life in Novyy Uzen and to stop the rumors aimed at straining interethnic relations is being strengthened. However, extremist individuals are greatly obstructing the stabilization of the situation in the city. They are not abandoning their attempts to provoke [word indistinct] arguments and (?create a confrontation) between the law-enforcing organs and the people. [passage indistinct]

Situation 'Normal' on Surface

PM2206112389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Jun 89 Second Edition p 3

[Correspondent D. Gutenev dispatch: "The Situation Remains Complex"]

[Text] Novyy Uzen (Guryev Oblast), 21 Jun—On the surface the situation in the city is returning to normal. Demonstrations took place yesterday in curfew conditions, but they were dispersed without the use of weapons or other means. Some 62 people were detained for breaches of the curfew last night.

Nonetheless, the situation remains complex. There are persistent rumors of cruelty by the forces which maintain order. Instigators are intimidating oilmen, gas processing workers, drivers, and store sales personnel.... But enterprises have not suspended their work.

There were disturbances last night and today in Munayshi and Zhetybay Settlements 70 km outside Novyy Uzen or the road to Shevchenko. The participants made the same demands: Abolition of coupons for some products, removal of the militia, deportation of persons of Caucasian nationalities. Two persons were admitted to hospital with firearm wounds.

Demonstrators at last Sunday's rally, which was attended by representative of republic and oblast party and soviet organs, presented an ultimatum calling for the removal of immigrants from the Caucasus from the city. Their demand was accompanied by threats.

Novyy Uzen's airport is filled with families wishing to fly to Makhachkala. The panic among people of Caucasian nationalities is being dampened by the "Solidarity" Public Committee, which was set up a few days ago and is headed by N. Beybutov, instructor with the city party committee.

Guryev Oblast Soviet Executive Committee has set up four commissions. They are analyzing the selection and placement of cadres and studying questions of employment, observance of passport regulations and housing distribution, and organization of trade and cooperatives' activity. Leaders of party, soviet, and law enforcement organs are receiving citizens and conducting explanatory work among the population.

Nazarbayev Replaces Kolbin as Kazakh Party Head

LD2206102689 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0954 GMT 22 Jun 89

[Text] Alma-Ata, 22 Jun (TASS)—TASS correspondent Raisa Ioffe reports:

A plenum of the Kazakh Communist Party Central Committee, which examined an organizational issue, took place today. The 49-year-old Kazakh, Nursultan Nazarbayev, who since 1984 has led the Council of Ministers of the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic, was elected first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of this Soviet Asian republic with a population of more than 16 million.

The plenum released Gennadiy Kolbin from duties as first secretary of the Central Committee in connection with his election by the USSR Supreme Soviet as chairman of the USSR People's Control Committee.

Nursultan Nazarbayev, as one of the authors of the new concept of regional financial autonomy for Kazakhstan, enjoys great authority among the republic's deputies, when on 26 March this year almost 250,000 votes were cast for him from among the 270,000 electors of the Alma-Ata-Iliy territorial constituency.

In his first 10 years of working life Nursultan Jazarbayev was a steel worker at the Karaganda metallurgical combine. In 1973 he was elected secretary of the combine's party committee. He later worked as secretary and second secretary of the Karaganda Oblast Committee of the Kazakh Communist Party, and in 1979 he was elected secretary of the Kazakh Communist Party Central Committee.

Personality Profile of Yegor Ligachev Published

AU1306134089 Sofia POGLED in Bulgarian No 24, 12 Jun 89 p 7

[Article by Leonid Zhmirev, PRAVDA correspondent in Bulgaria; "Key to Ligachev"]

[Text] He does not assume a waiting posture, does not stand above the fray, and does not adhere to the principle: let's see who the winner is, and then declare our support. He bravely attacks, often throws down the gauntlet, and never withholds his answer. He is a polemicist and works passionately in the political arena, often without a helmet.

Is this not the reason he has so many supporters and opponents? Sometimes they contrast him with Gorbachev himself, and at other times with Yeltsin. They connect with his name the "Russian" direction of restructuring, and sometimes reproach him for being a conservative. In any event, he is well known, people talk and argue about him, and even compose anecdotes and folk verses. Let me quote one:

The rooster crows at six o'clock
Pugachev at nine,
The store opens at two,
And Ligachev holds the key.

This folklore verse of the 1980's reflects Yegor Kumzich's irreconcilable position in the struggle against alcoholism. People believe that he adhered to the most radical and strict measures—curbing the production and trade with alcoholic beverages. He himself does not drink, he is, as you say in Bulgaria, a total abstainer, and tries to convey to all his own attitude toward the "green snake." You understood this. According to those who suffer, the key of the liquor stores, the taverns, and other drinking establishments was in his pocket. Naturally, this caused great suffering to those who were affected. Of course, I am only joking.

Let us move to more serious subjects. In the many public statements in the era of restructuring and glasnost one can easily discern the differences and specific nuances that characterize the political platforms of Gorbachev, Yakovlev, Shevardnadze, and Yeltsin. Add Ligachev to

those four names, and you will get the five most picturesque personalities of revolutionary restructuring in the USSR. Does it have its own Marat, Robespierre, and Danton?....

Where the resemblance ends the difference begins. They call Gorbachev the Gagarin of politics, and this actually says it all. They connect the name of Yakovlev with fundamental breakthroughs in philosophy, and the theory of restructuring, such as the priority of universal over class-party considerations, glasnost and democracy, pluralism of opinions, and the diverse variants of public opinion. Shevardnadze is associated with dismantling the "enemy image," eliminating the use of coercive methods, and deideologization of international relations.

As far as Yeltsin is concerned, people often call him the Russian Danton, leftist, radical, and leaning to radical measures. Was he not precisely the one who criticized the secretary general and other Politburo members in personal terms, accusing them of "improvizations" and of slowness in restructuring the party itself. He fought to eliminate the privileges of the apparatus, to have direct elections for the posts of secretary general and president, to reduce the official terms of all party and state posts to one election term, and so forth.

Why are we speaking in detail about Yeltsin's position when we really want to speak about Ligachev? Simply because they represent the two poles of the party platform of the CPSU Central Committee. It is easier to understand Ligachev when one compares him to Yeltsin. Both grew up "in the depths of Russia". One was for a long time leader of the Tomsk Oblast party committee, the other of Sverdlovsk Oblast party committee. Both have clearly demonstrated colorful personalities and have distinguished themselves as party leaders, capable of attracting the masses. I do not say "chieftains" [vozhdove] but leaders [vodachi], because this is closer to the truth....

Why did their positions draw so radically apart and why did their verbal dual become almost the central event in the polemics of the 19th All-Union Party Conference? Why did a special folklore subsequently emerge, expressed in political buttons reading: "Boris, You Are Wrong!," "Et Tu Boris?," "Boris, This Is Monstrous!" and so forth? Why it was precisely Ligachev who sharply and clearly assumed a position on rejecting Yeltsin and the other "innovators" of restructuring?

Let us substantiate what we are saying and turn to the text of Yegor Kumzich's 1 July 1988 statement at the Party Conference and the 5 August 1988 statement in the city of Gorkiy.

"We proceed from the class nature of international relations. Any other formulation of the issue only introduces confusion in the thinking of the Soviet people and our friends abroad." So much for the class approach.

This is what he said about the party approach: "As far as the Communists are concerned, their participation in strikes and illegal gatherings is clearly and simply incompatible with party membership. There can be no other solution."

Let us quote another statement, this time about market relations under socialism: "We cannot ignore the fact that market relations are inevitably accompanied in the capitalist society by deep social divisions, deepening the inequality, and the concentration of wealth in the hands of a small part of society. Must we really reproduce all this in our country?"

Finally, a quotation about glasnost, the blank spots of history, and the press: "Comrades, is it really possible to accept the fact that under the flag of restoring historical truth, the latter is often completely distorted? Is it really possible to accept the fact that Soviet people—in our printed publications too!—are presented as slaves (I am almost quoting here) who were allegedly fed only lies and demogoguery and subjected to the harshest exploitation?"

We might agree or disagree with these statements, but we cannot ignore the fact that they represent a certain position. We could say that this position much resembles the well-known "I Cannot Relinquish My Principles," and that it represents the fiercely fighting pre-restructuring consciousness. However, we cannot ignore the fact that this position is not a voice in the wilderness, but a reflection of a very widespread attitude in the party and society. Precisely this is the core of the matter. Yegor Kumzich is not alone. He does not stand alone in the political arena, but represents an influental part of the population and Communists. This is the key to Ligachev.

A few words about Ligachev's recent statement at the plenum: "On 12 May 1989 Nikolay Ivanov, investigator of the USSR Public Prosecutor's Office, stated that in a criminal case of bribery 'new Politburo members started to be glimpsed frequently,' and here my name was mentioned. I consider it a provocation, a wicked invention. It casts upon me, as a citizen and member of the CPSU Central Committee, the shadow of suspicion of a grave crime."

What is so attractive about Ligachev? It is not the fear of excessive publicity [razglasa], but his passion and the conviction of his own rightness. The categorical tone, the radical condemnation of the "increasing political careerism," the accusation that the press provides vast opportunities to "slander people," and of course, the method of self-defense "from the top." "I think that you would agree that such slanderous accusations affect not only my honor and integrity, but also the honor and integrity of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo."

How can we end this article? Ligachev's figure—first of all it represents a political and human position, which compels us to take it into consideration, and because of this alone it evokes respect. He does not hide behind the backs of other people, and has a face, not a mask.

How should we regard him? He is one of the banks lashed by the stormy river of restructuring. Which bank is it—right or left? This is a fact that is not determined by us, journalists, but by the river itself.

Ligachev Speech, Article Collection Published

LD1906142389 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1300 GMT 19 Jun 89

[Text] A collection of speeches made and articles written by Comrade Ligachev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, has been issued. The book describes topical questions concerning the activity of the CPSU, the implementation of restructuring, and the renewal of Soviet society. The collection is designed for the party aktiv staff, ideological and scientific workers, and a broad range of readers. The book has been published by Politizdat.

Further Reports on Fergana Oblast Disturbances

Officials 'Unprepared' for Crisis

18300697 Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian 15 Jun 89 p 2

[Article by Vil. Niyazmatov, LITERATURNAYA GAZETA correspondent: "Anxiety and Hopes"]

[Text] For more than 2 weeks now the citizens of Fergana Valley have been starting every morning with anxiety and hope. They are uneasy. Has yet another person's life come to an end during the night? Have the bandits committed an outrage upon yet another victim guilty only of his nationality: the Meskhetian Turk? They hope that this vandalism and barbarity resembling the dark Middle Ages will finally come to an end.

It is no secret by now that extremist elements are not just groups of hooligans. A well-thought-through and organized action is behind the outbreaks of violence. The extremists keep to the tactics developed and planned ahead of time, aimed at destabilizing the situation in Uzbekistan and in our entire country, although some people still continue to believe that what has happened is only the result of the young people of the two nationalities offending each other.

If only that were true!

One thinks that the events would have turned out differently had the party and soviet functionaries been up to the task in this extraordinary situation, had the functionaries of the internal affairs organs and the KGB [State Security Committee] been able to discern the looming danger in a timely manner and discover the actions of those who have caused these events, those who have been able to spread fear and death, those who have been able to prove, even if temporarily, their superior strength and tactical actions. After all, there have been many signs attesting to efficient coordination among seemingly disjointed bandit formations, and the skillful and purposeful fueling of discord between nationalities which had lived in peace as good neighbors for decades.

The extremist and corrupt elements have proved that their "ideological work" is also thoughtfully managed—the very kind of work which is supposed to be the domain of party and Komsomol [Leninist Communist Youth League] organs. They have managed to set up the publication of their leaflets and to disseminate them in broad daylight among the populace, thus recruiting to their cause a good number of unstable individuals, primarily from among the young people. Using various means, they have pieced together in their photo laboratories the "atrocities" which allegedly occurred in Kuvasay on 23 May.

Unfortunately the leaflet "The Truth About Kuvasay" (prepared by the oblast party committee) appeared...as late as 10 June. Had it appeared 2 weeks earlier, the monstrous fire of ethnic discord may not have broken out in the Fergana Valley. To what can the unforgivable sluggishness of party committees be attributed? Perplexity? A nonstandard situation?

All of this is a consequence of the stereotypical style of operation of ideological establishments which based their activities on slogans and appeals developed over the years. All of this is a consequence of the incompetence of officials now heading ideological sectors in the party committees of the oblast.

The sluggishness, not to use the word "negligence," of managers of the mass media in Fergana Oblast cannot but surprise us. Various rumors, at times the most implausible, and the ever more frightening cock-and-bull stories about the events in Kuvasay swept the area with rapid force, whereas local journalists assumed a wait-and-see attitude. For example, the oblast newspaper FERGANSKAYA PRAVDA offered to its readers a detailed report on what had actually happened in Kuvasay as many as...20 days later. Why did the newspapers of Fergana and the radio display this crying lack of dispatch? The so to speak "position" of the secretary of the oblast party committee in charge of the mass media, T. Egamberdiyeva, is one of the reasons. As one of my Fergana colleagues says, she literally forbade publication of the already written materials on the Kuvasay events.

One thinks that had a majority of the population been informed objectively and in a timely manner, many would have not been led astray by the bandits that easily.

Everything should be done so the people learn the truth about the murders, arson, and marauding which still occur—the truth, no matter how bitter it is.

The carelessness of party and soviet functionaries has more or less extended to the functionaries of the internal affairs organs and the KGB. At present the common opinion in Fergana Valley is widely known—they talked about the looming tragedy in all bazaars of the area, but not at the party, soviet, and law enforcement organs.

Let us take, for example, the chief of the Internal Affairs Directorate of the Fergana Oblast Executive Committee, Major General S. Burkhanov, who is still not perturbed in the least, strange as it may be. Having met him, I attempted to hear his evaluation of what has happened, an evaluation of the actions of his service in the emergent situation. Sultan Yusupovich was far from being self-critical. Moreover, he attributed the frightening results of excesses by bandits to...the low number of militia personnel in Fergana—not a word about his and his subordinates being caught unprepared, and a majority of them displaying a real lack of resourcefulness and professionalism!

I also wanted to solicit answers from the KGB chief of Fergana Oblast. However, the duty officer told me that the chief of the Fergana Oblast KGB Directorate, General N. Leskov, had refused to receive the correspondent of a central newspaper. I decided to approach the KGB after a conversation with oblast prosecutor A. Atadzhanov, who, in the presence of republic prosecutor D. Usatov, justifiably lamented the fact that unfortunately in this situation the services of state security and internal affairs in the oblast turned out not to be up to the task. The reluctance of General Leskov to help the mass media get a more profound understanding of what has happened is all the more strange because, as the newspapers reported, it was quite recently stressed at the collegium of the KGB that restructuring and glasnost had been given "the right of abode" in the most serious manner in all services of the committee as well.

However, when tested it has turned out not to be the case in all services! It is a pity! After all, it has been exactly the concealment of information in this situation that has spawned various rumors which the extremists have exploited in order to fuel the ethnic discord for their own mercenary motives.

...The oblast adjacent to Fergana, Namangan Oblast, has also become restless. Several days ago, toward night, more than 300 persons attempted to capture the railway terminal in Namangan. This attempt was rebuffed by the local militia. The activization of criminal elements in other rayons of the oblast has also been noted.

Self-defense detachments are being set up in Fergana and Namangan Oblasts, which, in close cooperation with the militia and units of internal troops, are doing everything in order to maintain peace and stability in the region.

Member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers N.I. Ryzhkov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and CPSU Central Committee Secretary V.M. Chebrikov, and USSR Minister of Internal Affairs V.V. Bakatin are staying in Uzbekistan at present in order to take radical measures in the emergent situation. They have visited the areas in which the bandits have committed atrocities and talked to the citizens of Fergana Oblast. They also visited a temporary camp for Meskhetian Turks located at the training center of a military unit in the vicinity of Fergana. N.I. Ryzhkov has assured the refugees that the government will do everything necessary in order to recover from the tragedy so that the people will feel safe. Those guilty will be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law.

Underlying Causes Speculated Upon

PM2106153989 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 21 Jun 89 First Edition pp 1, 4

[Special correspondent Lieutenant Colonel V. Astafyev dispatch: "Background to Events"]

[Text] Fergana, 19 Jun—The situation in Fergana Oblast is stabilizing. And now many people are asking: Why were the Meskhetian Turks actually picked as targets by those who incited the frenzied crowd element into murder, arson, and violence? One would have thought that two peoples, especially when sharing a common faith, could live together in our country. What was the threat posed by the 5,000 Turks living until recently in Kuvasay to the city's 20,000 residents?

Of course, the initial explanation that events were stirred up by an argument over a glass of beer in a teahouse now appears more than trivial. There is also another explanation—rivalry between two mafia groupings. But even that, taking into account the large-scale actions against all oblast residents of Turkish nationality, is hard to believe. So, what were the causes which forced more than 15,000 Meskhetian Turks to abandon their homes and the possessions accumulated over the years and to flee for their lives from Uzbekistan, which has always been famous for its hospitality?

I heard different stories in conversations with city residents in the streets of Fergana. For example, a middle-aged man who wished to remain anonymous brusquely told me: "They only have themselves to blame; there was no reason to be obstinate." What were they to blame for? What were the Meskhetian Turks obstinate about?

I made my way to the refugee camp in search of an answer to these questions. There I happened to come across Fikri Shukurov, who was until last year oblast section chairman of the Meskhetian Turks' Provisional Organizational Committee. My interlocutor was unable to offer a sensible answer to the questions I asked. He

does not know what fueled the hostile actions by his former neighbors. But I shall nonetheless quote some passages from his narrative.

"Last fall I was planning to travel from Fergana to Samarkand for a meeting of Meskhetian Turks. I decided to hire a private taxi operator and struck a deal in Tashlak with Akhipov, an Uzbek by nationality. Akhmedova, chairman of the Kuvasay City Committee [gorkom], met me in the afternoon and warned me that Turkish writers were due to arrive soon and a meeting with them had been scheduled for the evening. I went to Akhipov. We spent a long time drinking tea, and when I asked about the car the host told me that the driver would soon be there. But one of our Turks came instead of him, accompanied by an Uzbek by the name of Alimzhan, a journalist from Tashkent. They brought posters and tickets.

"Alimzhan said that a meeting with Turkish writers would be held at the cement combine stadium on Sunday. I immediately noticed that the posters gave the names of Uzbek writers but written in the Turkish style. Alimzhan warned that the tickets should be distributed only among Turks. 'But why not do it officially,' I asked, 'and do the city soviet and party leaders know about this?'

" 'We won't talk about that,' Alimzhan grinned in reply. Then I asked about the purpose of this meeting. 'We'll be sowing seeds,' Alimzhan gestured as if wielding a stick, 'and we'll be getting rid of all the surplus.' 'Us as well,' I clarified. 'No, you are also Muslims, we'll get rid of the Russians, we've been under their heel for 70 years, we'll be our own masters.'

"I realized that the whole affair smacked of provocation and refused to accept the posters and tickets. That evening I brought together our committee members, told them about this conversation, and warned them not to get involved in any shady business. I also spoke of this at the meeting in Samarkand. I said that attempts were being made to involve us in some dirty business."

...Radykhan Ismailov, a respected figure in the Turkish community, also had a similar meeting with the man calling himself Alimzhan. Ismailov also refused to take part in the plot.

A few days ago, leaflets in the Uzbek language appeared in Fergana and the refugee camp, containing an appeal to the oblast population supposedly written by some national organizations: "Stop! Not in order to retreat, not because you have lost, but in order to give the matter some deep thought.... In order to be able to speak and proudly hold up your heads tomorrow.... Today let us pause at the rest site known as courage."

There you have it: these are the calls issued by people who try to speak on behalf of the whole people. Not to feel horrified, not to feel shocked by what has happened, but to regroup their forces so as to target them against the next victims tomorrow. Murders, arson, and violence are matters of "courage" for them.

Could it be that the anger of the corrupt circles behind the events fell upon the heads of Meskhetian Turks because they refused to get involved in the proposed plot? Could this be the reason why they set their puppets, poisoned by the venom of drugs and alcohol, against the Meskhetian Turks? To crush and destroy the recalcitrant, to drive them away, to display their strength, to intimidate the rest of their intended allies—is this not the goal of the pogrom organizers? Is this not the place to seek the true causes of the tragedy of the Meskhetian Turks?

These were the questions I asked of Eduard Alekseyevich Didorenko, Uzbekistan's first deputy minister of internal affairs:

"Today, on the basis of already established facts, it can be unambiguously said that we are certainly talking not about some sort of isolated and unconnected attempts, but about a mass campaign to involve the Turkish population in the crucible of a pernicious interethnic conflict," he said. "Ever since last fall certain forces embarked at different levels on the most energetic attempts to knock together a united pan-Islamic front, whose primary tasks were to revive medieval nationalist hysteria and discrimination, and to hound out the republic's European population, even by using radical measures.

"The Meskhetians were assigned the unenviable role of some sort of emotional symbol of the unity of Muslims of all nationalities in the proposed homespun "Gazzavat" [as transliterated; possibly a form of the Arabic word "Ghazwah" meaning invasion or conquest]. They relied primarily on speculation around events during the Stalin period, when the Turks were deported from their historical places of residence. Demagogical exhortations by political adventurers were dressed up in the poisoned garb of nationalism and intolerance toward adherents of other faiths. But the far-reaching designs of the newly-hatched "messiahs" were not destined to materialize; the extremist leaders miscalculated on a grand scale.

"The most highly respected members of the Meskhetian Turks' Provisional Organizational Committee showed the door to the uninvited well-wishers, firmly refusing to join them in blocs and to sow the seeds of ethnic dissension in the family of USSR peoples. This disobedience was not to the liking of the organizers of this dubious enterprise, who could not disregard the fact that any publicity for their unseemly activity would have had a negative effect on their political reputation. It was therefore no accident that what appeared to be a local incident between Meskhetians and the indigenous population developed in Samarkand Oblast's Akdarinskiy Rayon back in very early May. This was followed by a larger-scale incident in Kuvasay, and finally the lamentable conclusion.

"It is also appropriate to recall that the speech by N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, at the party and economic aktiv meeting in Tashkent specifically pointed out that the tragic events which occurred in Fergana Oblast are a thoroughly planned large-scale political action by extremists. Consequently, it is not hard to determine the subsequent steps by the forces which provoked the tragedy, as well as their tactical and strategic designs. As the people say in their wisdom, a case of the thief shouting 'Stop thief.'

"It cannot be ruled that the extremists will try to involve the press, radio, and television in their frenzied campaign of lies, or that we may hear 'salvos' aimed at discrediting the role played by Internal Troops servicemen and militia staffers who took part in eliminating the mass disorders, as well as a collection of accusations of cruelty and unlawful actions by them.

"Briefly speaking, I assume that all possible measures will be taken to distort the truth and conceal the roots which produced the evil manifestations of barbarism.

"We cannot allow this to happen," E.A. Didorenko said in conclusion.

Arrests Continue; Death Toll at 98

PM2106113989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
21 Jun 89 Second Edition p 3

[PRAVDA correspondent report: "Questions and Answers. Events in Fergana Oblast"]

[Text] Fergana, 20 Jun—An excerpt from the daily report issued by the Fergana Oblast commandant reads as follows: "The situation in cities and rayons is stabilizing and is under control."

This statement is the result of the work of many hundreds of soldiers and officers in the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs [MVD] troops and the militia. The work of clearing up the crimes committed by extremist elements and groups of hooligans is continuing with the aid of the local population. Thus, two strangers who infiltrated a safehouse for Meskhetian Turkish evacuees were arrested when neighbors raised the alarm. The men who were arrested were carrying sidearms. In Kokand, Block No 78 on Silikatnaya Street, which had been looted, was set on fire. Ye. Nurman died in hospital from wounds sustained 5 June. A total of 98 people have died since these events began.

Staffers from the republic's MVD Criminal Investigation Department reported at a briefing for journalists that the laborious work of determining the identity of the dead and establishing the circumstances of their death has been completed. The names of a dozen victims whose remains were badly burned or dismembered have not been identified. Criminal proceedings have been instituted against 41 people.

Colonel V. Shlanev, chief of a USSR MVD Specialist Criminological Administration department, announced that, according to preliminary data, the weapons confiscated from the criminals were manufactured to the same design.

In the last 24 hours 210 weapons have been confiscated and 8 people have been arrested for hooligan activities. Political workers from the internal troop units that have arrived in the oblast are teaming up with local party organs to hold numerous meetings at labor collectives and places of residence, explaining the situation, and answering questions.

Colonel Ye. Nechayev, deputy chief of the USSR MVD Internal Troops Political Directorate, said: We visited the "Fergananefteorgsintez" Production Association yesterday. Sh. Yuldashev, first secretary of the oblast party committee, and USSR people's deputies addressed the collective. The people are worried above all by the following question: Who is to blame for what has happened? We explained that the bandits must not under any circumstances be identified with the entire Uzbek people. Specific people are to blame for the riots, and they will be called to account by law.

Uzbek Draft Language Law Published for Discussion

PM2106103989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
20 Jun 89 First Edition p 2

[UzTAG-TASS report: "Draft Language Law"]

[Text] Uzbekistan's republic newspapers have published for nationwide discussion the draft Uzbek Soviet Socialist Republic language law, which gives Uzbek state language status. This document, which contains 11 chapters and 39 articles, proclaims the status of Russian as a means of interethnic discourse and reaffirms the right of all those living in the republic to use their native language.

According to the draft, the language of sessions and conferences will, "as a rule," be Uzbek, with translations being provided for people who do not speak it. Nobody is entitled to refuse a citizen a service on the pretext of ignorance of Uzbek or Russian. Workers in the services sphere must know these languages to the necessary standard. Subordinates may choose their working language in their work relations.

The draft sets out guarantees both for language learning and for translations from Uzbek to be provided for participants in official, legal, and other contacts in the official, production, and cultural spheres. A special chapter reinforces the right of Tajiks, Kazakhs, Kirghiz, Turkmens, Tartars, Crimean Tartars, Uighurs, Central Asian Jews, and representatives of other peoples to be educated and carry out official business [ofitsialnoye obshcheniye] in their native languages.

The public has greeted with interest provisions in the draft law such as assistance for those willing to learn the old Uzbek writing system based on Arabic script and the compulsory requirement that postal and telegraphic correspondence within the republic be accepted in the Uzbek and Russian languages.

Although the draft mentions that the law will be "phased in," no details are given about these phases or the material and technical backup for them. A month passed between the signing of the decree on the publication of the draft (18 May) and the actual publication. Two months have been set aside for discussion of the future law; consequently, its submission to the republic's Supreme Soviet will coincide with the start of the mass cotton harvest.

Racial Clashes Rooted in Stalin Era

PM2106102589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Jun 89 Morning Edition p 1

[Valeriy Vyzhutovich article: "The Congress and the Nationalities Question"]

[Text] Lenin's words that "1. We must not fight. 2. Concessions must be made. 3. A large state cannot be compared with a small one," spoken in the icy February of 1923, reverberated in the hot, sunny May of 1989 as if responding to the echo of Sumgait, the tragedy in Tbilisi, and the shots in the Fergana Valley. No, nobody repeated these words from the rostrum of the Congress of People's Deputies, but everyone—those inside the hall and those thousands of kilometers away from it—came close to clearly realizing that their own future is part and parcel of our common future.

The words were not heard. What was heard was their meaning—wise, admonitory, applicable to all mankind.

This was the first time that people had voiced interethnic contradictions, insults, frustrations, and yearnings for autonomy from the rostrum of an assembly that was truly an assembly of the whole people at the top of their voices, even shouting at times. The congress broke the years-long vow of silence on nationalities questions—a silence which was held out to be the supreme manifestation of internationalism by optimists during the Stalin-Brezhnev epoch. Finally, the genre of social myth-making acquired a joyful song about a "united family" where happiness, calm, and prosperity reigned, while peoples were being forcibly resettled and millions of people of different nationalities were departing the land where they were born and where they grew up, on their way to Siberia or Kazakhstan—wherever they were ordered to go.

Honestly speaking (and the congress witnessed this), this old song was heard inside the hall now and again, and its breath could be felt either in the condescending smiles with which some people greeted the emotional speech by Deputy Ye. Gayer about the fate of smaller peoples in the north, or in the hisses of displeasure with representatives of the Baltic republics: Wait a minute, they were told, let us first solve the state problems, and your turn will come eventually. Nonetheless, another tune could be heard with growing loudness, maturity, and responsibility: The state does not and cannot have any problems which do not affect all the peoples inhabiting it. There can be no happiness for the whole people if things are not going well in the homes of Meskhetian Turks, Volga Germans, Crimean Tatars, or anyone else.

The congress demonstrated that the nationalities question does not exist in a pure form. The high-voltage interethnic tension with its dangerous short-circuits—be they brief or prolonged—has just one breeding ground: the administrative edict system. Economic disorder, empty store shelves, rising crime, moral decline—these shoots of the seeds sown by Stalin bore fruit during the years of stagnation; however, on the republics' territories and under the conditions in which the center has administrative omnipotence, this "harvest" is evaluated with particular bias.... Deputies spoke of many problems as being nationalities problems, but this is not always the case. "The simplest approach would be to attribute events like those in Tbilisi to an outburst of national emotions," Deputy G. Gumbaridze said. "But surely some of them were, to a certain extent, manifestations of the results of well-known deformations of socialism, and especially of the constitutionally enshrined federal principles of Soviet statehood, which were allowed to occur in the country for decades on end?"

The thunder in that selfsame Fergana Valley certainly did not come out of the blue. The clouds of annoyance and discontent, which released a barbarous downpour over the heads of Meskhetian Turks, had not been gathering for just a year or two. The deep-rooted causes of the events now occurring in Uzbekistan cannot be perceived if they are to be sought only and exclusively in relations between two nations. Pay attention to the persistence with which deputies from that republic spoke about cotton when reflecting on the present situation of their people: a single-crop economy holds complete sway over 3 million hectares rigidly protected against incursion by grain, feed, vegetable, and other "catch" crops, as well as over labor standards and human relations (state subsidies running to R5 billion represent the annual payment for the Uzbek economy's slant toward cotton); thousands of human destinies, of adults and children alike, have been sacrificed to the "white gold" which the chosen used to mint the stars they wear on their chests; hundreds of thousands of fit men are not employed in the national economy, while schoolchildren work on the plantations from September to December.

And how about the situation in the Baltic republics, where enterprises are built on union ministries' say-so and import manpower from everywhere because of the shortage of local labor resources? The indigenous population's angry looks at those honest toilers—innocent culprits who naturally and perfectly legitimately claim

apartments, kindergarten places, and other earthly goods—are programmed into the irrational deployment of the country's production forces.

Deputies cited many similar examples and drew the conclusion: The edict economy tends to exacerbate interethnic relations. This is why the idea of regional economic accountability was actively discussed both from the congress rostrum and in the congress lobbies. Some people like it, other do not, but it is perfectly obvious that excessive centralization of economic ties not only hinders the economy's normal blood circulation but also produces dangerous embolisms in our social organism's communicating vessels and, in particular, ties the knots of national conflicts and contradictions. Just think: The 1924 Constitution envisaged the creation of just 5 all-union and 5 amalgamated people's commissariats; more than 80 central ministries and departments were functioning in the country by the late seventies; there were more than 100 of them while the congress was at work. This is why the congress' decision to abolish a number of union subdivisions ought to be appraised not only as a matter of economic reorganization but also as a political step pursuing, among others, the goal of slackening the reins and allowing republics to govern [pravit] themselves autonomously—not haphazardly but in the direction where national interests interlock with statewide interests.

I wrote "allow," and I paused to think. It is obvious that the habit of exercising legitimate rights...by permission is still built into our genes. The republics' right to sovereignty is enshrined in the constitution—so what permission are we talking about? Alas, this reservation is not accidental. For decades on end the equality of peoples and their right to autonomy remained nothing but declarations in the Constitution. Any attempt to even remind people of this right was easily and swiftly cut short, or treated as suspicious.

Yes, Lenin's idea of our union's federative structure did not materialize, and for many years national statehood was nothing more than a symbol, a ritual, verbal homage to a line in the Fundamental Law. Now we see that the state's integrity can be preserved by taking, as M.S. Gorbachev said in his closing speech, "a constructive path, through democratization, glasnost, mutual understanding, cooperation, and dialogue." It is necessary—and the congress reaffirmed this—to give the USSR both the content and the form of a union of equal and sovereign republics. There is need for amendments to the Constitution ensuring a return to Lenin's ideas of federalism. The path of integrating potentials and interests is still more reasonable than and preferable to the path of unquestioning obedience to the center. Otherwise we will have again a struggle between republics and bureaucratic centralism, automatically perceived as struggle against Russia.

As a matter of fact, and in the opinion of many deputies, the Russian people's fate is also subject to hard trials. This is to be expected: Their fate has never been easy. Russia has paid a high price to ensure that the country's republics did not feel done out of anything. Of course, subsidy "injections" are not the best way to maintain a normal economic state of health, but they did do their job. But now Russia's cities and villages face the selfsame problems as many national regions. Society's crisis condition commands that efforts be pooled in order to jointly advance to a life befitting man at the close of the 20th century.

Yes, we are different people in a large multinational country. We speak different languages, we differ in our religions, cultural standards, and civilizations. So it is hardly possible to live without arguments, clashes of opinions, or polemics—and that is hardly likely to be achieved—because these are the condition and the guarantee of development. This is a simple and clear idea. It may be the main result of the congress debates on the nationalities question. A socialist state begins with the recognition of every people's right to be themselves and with respect for that right.

...While finishing off this article, I saw on the desk before me newspaper reports on events in the Fergana Valley. Unprecedently nasty disturbances have gone on for 13 days. The number of tragic victims is high; passions are overheated. Without going into the causes of the conflict, I can say this: Knives and bullets are poor interpreters. Curfew does not provide the best opportunity for settling relations.

And the editorial office teleprinter produced fresh news: Refugees are being accepted by Smolensk, Kursk, and Belgorod Oblasts. Several thousand of them have arrived. Russian families offer them shelter, food, rest, and care.

Two types of news reports about the sort of people we are today.... For as long as actions follow the former example, alarm and worry about the future of our common home will prevail. When actions follow the latter, hope and faith in reason, goodness, and charity will spring eternal. Yes, we are different. But we will always remain people. Come what may.

Disregard for Student Demands Prompts Unrest

PM2006133589 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 14 Jun 89 p 1

[V. Kismereshkin article under the rubric "Every Day in This Spot": " 'We Are the Forum!' Five Million Soviet Students Say Today"]

[Excerpts] [Passage omitted] Judging by the statute on VUZ's [higher educational institutions], which has been in force since 1969, students at best can count only on "participation in the discussion (and only via public organizations) of questions of improving the study process, ideological education work, and so on and so forth." The section on "duties" appears immeasurably more impressive. Students have virtually no rights, they

are in a subordinate and dependent position in relation to the administration and lecturers, and pedantry, like rust, corrodes the atmosphere of educational establishments. [passage omitted]

As before, the threat of settling scores at examination time hangs over "obstinate students" like the sword of Damocles. And lecturers' "joke" that a student's grade can be seen in his eyes at a lecture is not so far from the truth.

Contempt for students' opinions and interests prevails not only in the organization of the study process. Probably only we could have a situation where, by an arbitrary instruction "from above," students are sent to clean streets, participate in lengthy rehearsals the day before a demonstration, "keep the seats warm" for the presidium, and even fill an empty ice rink to order, something which I encountered on a trip to one Siberian city.... [passage omitted]

Obviously, if we want to get the country out of the crisis, it is necessary to look after the training of those who are going to assume the entire burden of the renewal processes.

For this reason, the sooner society revises its attitude to students and begins to talk with them in serious, statesmanlike language, the quicker it will get convinced specialists who are keen on renewal.

The students are awaiting such a conversation, they have really become aware of their strength. The work of the forum [All-Union Student Forum] preparatory committee and the constructive approach of student conferences in Leningrad, Alma-Ata, and Vladivostok indicate this. The decision adopted on deferring students' draft into the Army also confirms this. There is the hope that today, without waiting until the fall, the "powers that be" will take into account and analyze thoroughly the students' position regarding agricultural work and will thus remove the tension which has arisen in VUZ's.

A wave of rallies, strikes, and boycotts of classes has swept through VUZ's. Reports about them are no longer surprising, and you gradually get accustomed to the idea that strikes may happen not only in South Korea's universities. Some people get confused by them and panic, and in some places they are ready to accuse students out of hand of all kinds of excesses.

But we must realize that this result is not only the students' desire to resolve at a stroke the accumulated problems. No. It is also a consequence of the fact that those people who should have listened to students in time did not do so and again preferred to issue orders rather than have dialogue.

I am not going to say that the forum will be able to resolve all student problems instantly. But only by setting things in motion can anything be changed. The first step can be made with the forum's assistance.

Investigation Into Bashkiria Train Wreck Continues

18290205 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 15 Jun 89 p 3

[Article by staff correspondent V. Radziyevskiy in Ufa; unattributed report from Moscow: "The Versions Are Refined"]

[Text] **The scope of the hideous accident in Bashkiria is known by now; the mass information media regularly report on the measures being taken to deal with the consequences of the disaster. But what caused it, who is to blame?**

Alas, for the time being, there are no clear answers to these questions. Rumors are spreading. Some are persuaded that it was the result of sabotage. Others assert that the refinery products pipeline was damaged by a digging excavator; they say that not too long ago a power cable was being laid alongside it. Yet others report that the explosion occurred because of a section defectively welded into the pipeline.

Today it quite probably can be said that perhaps the accident occurred not by chance. The level of reliability of the refinery products pipeline stretching from Siberia to the Volga area is quite low. But that remains to be addressed. A large group of associates from the MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] and the USSR KGB are investigating the causes of the catastrophe.

For the time being several versions exist. According to one, the manufacturers of the pipe, the Chelyabinsk metallurgists, are guilty. A second says poor assembly and violation of operating instructions. Nor can mechanical damage to the pipe be ruled out.

There is one more fact that gives the experts something to consider. Further down the main pipe from the point of the explosion a bypass diverges, laid during the preliminary phase of the project. The line was brought into operation in 1985, but the bypass was not cut off. Could it have happened that the gas was flowing in two pipes simultaneously? It is known that on 2 June, the pipe was shut off. But for what reason, and for how long? It is not finally clear for now how long the gas leakage continued. O. Filanovskiy, deputy minister of the USSR Ministry of the Petroleum Industry, supports the version that the gas seeped for 15-20 minutes. But several other specialists believe that the leak lasted for several days.

When They Made Up the Number

V. Bulygin, chief technician of the operations department of Glavtransneft [Main Directorate for Transportation and Delivery of Petroleum, USSR Ministry of the Petroleum Industry], reported that it may turn out that the causes of the pipeline accidents in Bashkiria and Moldavia are similar. On both exploded pipes traces of damage apparently caused by construction equipment were found. In particular, there is a dent and scratches in

the metal of the Bashkir pipe. As we know, pipes can burst where they are thin. It is probable that the pipe did not withstand the pressure and burst at this spot. In pictures taken immediately after the accident, a lengthwise rupture about 1.5 meters long with torn edges is visible. Its width is approximately 60 centimeters.

The pipe could even have been damaged during construction. The administrative documents from that period must have been preserved, including an order signed by the section chief for the reverse backfill of a trench. Thus, it would not be too complicated to find those who participated in the work of the refinery products pipeline.

Monument to Victims Planned

PM1606142389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Jun 89 Second Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Flowers by the Granite"]

[Text] Ufa, 14 Jun—Two mighty granite slabs were placed on the scorched ground today. One of them bears this inscription: "Here will be erected a memorial to those who died as a result of the pipeline explosion 3 June 1989."

Ufa stonecutters worked the granite blocks delivered from Bashkiria's Mansurovskoye deposit, surrounded them with marble borders, and planted flowers in a matter of hours.

"Today only the site of the future memorial has been decided," G.G. Vedernikov, chairman of the Government Commission, said. "The decision to create it was made by our commission. The work will be carried out under the leadership of the autonomous republic's government."

USSR Can Learn From American Legal System

PM1906101589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 12 Jun 89 Morning Edition p 5

[Interview with Candidate of Juridical Sciences V. Vlasikhin, leader of the USSR Academy of Sciences United States of America and Canada Institute Group on Political-Legal Problems, by IZVESTIYA observer Yu. Feofanov, under the rubric "The World and Us": "The Hand of Vienna"; place and date of interview not given—first paragraph is introduction]

[Text] The principles proclaimed in the CSCE Final Document and national legislation—these provide the topic for a conversation between IZVESTIYA observer Yu. Feofanov and Candidate of Juridical Sciences V. Vlasikhin, leader of the USSR Academy of Sciences United States of America and Canada Institute Group on Political-Legal Problems.

[Feofanov] The Vienna meeting's Final Document states that the participating states affirmed a commitment to the CSCE process and emphasized its substantial role in "promoting respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms and **thus** (my emphasis—Yu.F.) consolidating international security." But can these two principles be so rigidly interlinked? International security would seem to be an external matter, as it were, while the rights and freedoms of each country's citizens are an internal matter. Surely different countries can strengthen security in the world while having completely different regimes? This kind of precedent, incidentally, can be found in history. What are we to be read in these words, Vasiliy Anatolyevich—a declaration, propaganda, or real substance?

[Vlasikhin] These two principles, as you called them, are not simply rigidly interlinked, they are fused together. Here we have a very simple logic. Unless there are guarantees of international security, there can be no guarantees of a man's rights and freedoms, no matter in which country he lives. On the other hand, the police stick wielded by a state inside its country inevitably becomes a military stick to be wielded outside it. A power which scorns the dignity and inalienable rights of its subjects, which is used to disregarding them and to having a free hand, will—in one way or another—extend the methods and usages it has developed to the sphere of contacts with others who are not its subjects. Therefore, completely different regimes—democratic and authoritarian—cannot strengthen security in the world: Crises, conflicts, and "trials of strength" are inevitable. In the pre-restructuring times, we had occasion to hear it said at meetings with the Americans: You Soviets cannot be trusted on disarmament questions simply because—if for no other reason—your assurances on human rights are fraudulent.

[Feofanov] If we take an unprejudiced look at our legislation, what fundamental amendments should we enact to ensure that our signature on the Vienna document does not remain simply a grand gesture? Of course, in this process we must bear in mind that social environments in the capitalist and socialist countries are, to put it mildly, rather dissimilar. Let us take a look at our country's Fundamental Law. Does it need amendment in the light of the Vienna document?

[Vlasikhin] In order to ensure that our signature on the Vienna document does not remain just a grand gesture, it is necessary to radically restructure the legal system. Briefly speaking, Soviet law must be given the functions of **upholding rights** [pravozashchitnyye]. At present it still performs **policing** [okhrannyye] functions—it protects the bureaucratic state and the apparatus from the citizen. We still lack reliable legal institutions on which Soviet people can depend in defending their proclaimed rights and freedoms. People write to you in the newspaper about their tribulations and humiliations and about the authorities' injustice, having failed to get legal backing from "law enforcement" departments.... For people to be able to uphold their rights in law and with help from the law, we need: Full glasnost (both freedom to express opinions verbally, in writing, in print, and through demonstrations, and free access to information);

separation of powers—party, legislative, executive, and judicial; restrictive regulation of state powers (especially coercive and punitive) and constitutional oversight exercised by an independent and authoritative judiciary; and full and comprehensive legal aid by an independent body of defense lawyers. And any dispute with an official or a state organ should be settled only through the courts.

The actual Constitution itself perhaps does not need any "drastic" amendment in the light of the Vienna document.

[Feofanov] Yes, our Fundamental Law does not contradict universally accepted legal norms. But I am reluctant to digress from the realities of life. Take freedom of residence, for example. In other words, the notorious residence permits. People are justifiably fulminating about them. But if the state (soviet) allocates apartments free of charge according to set norms and if, in the event of the apartment being reallocated to someone else, it is forced to put people back on the waiting list and give them free housing again—how can residence permits be abolished? And yet residence permits are an insurmountable obstacle to the exercise of the right to free choice of residence. I cannot move freely in my own country: I have the right, but there are no rooms to be had even in hotels. Or take the international aspect, for example. Fine, let us abolish all obstacles to travel outside the country, but how is this right to be exercised without foreign currency?

[Vlasikhin] From the socioeconomic point of view, residence permits and passport regulations are justified by reference to the need to control migration and prevent the overpopulation of cities where "there is more sausage to be had." Of course, the fact that people "have the right, but there are no rooms to be had in hotels" is also rooted in the economy's underdevelopment.

As for the political aspect of the passport and residence permit regime, it is rooted in our state's authoritarian traditions. We may believe (at times even sincerely) that residence permits and internal passports are a forced necessity, and we may try to persuade Western participants in the dialogue on human rights accordingly. But our opponents are convinced: The passport and residence permit regime is tantamount to police control of society.

[Feofanov] But residence permits did not come about solely for control purposes. Let us not forget the free distribution of housing.

[Vlasikhin] I agree, some sort of regulation is necessary. Nonetheless, a genuine rule-of-law state and a passport and residence permit regime cannot coexist. As a matter of fact, freedom of movement is not mentioned either in our Constitution or in the U.S. Constitution. Nonetheless, the U.S. Supreme Court classifies freedom of movement and of choice of place of residence as fundamental freedoms implicit in the Constitution.

Now about the international aspect and foreign currency. If you have the money, this should be no concern of the authorities. It is a different matter that maybe the time has come to take care of the sale of "currency" at the real exchange rate rather than the one you publish in IZVESTIYA.

[Feofanov] When talking about combating terrorism, the drugs business, and other similar crimes, I would imagine that there are hardly any differences between member states—this is a shared evil. But when talking about encroachments on the institutions of the social system in each country (be it capitalist or socialist), only too many specific features surface. The right to strike, for example, is one thing in countries where the state is "indifferent" to a firm's future and where, in any case, settling conflicts with workers is the firm's business. But it is a completely different thing in countries where the production process is an integrated system, and the owner is the people as represented by the state. Like a chain reaction, a strike at one enterprise could have catastrophic results for the economy and, consequently, for people's prosperity. Here it is very difficult to marry the two concepts in the legal sense: If they have it "over there," some people say, we must have it here as well. It is understandable that the Vienna document does not go into such details. But "fighters for rights" with extremist leanings are capable of producing arguments along these lines.

[Vlasikhin] The capitalist state is not indifferent to the state of affairs in the economy or to the future of corporations. The United States, for example, has a sophisticated legal mechanism for the settlement of labor conflicts. In a strike situation, the state plays the role of active mediator between entrepreneurs and strikers. The legislation offers detailed regulations on who must take what action in the event of a potential or actual strike. There are categories of workers who—in view of the nature of their employment—cannot exercise the right to strike. The court is the final arbiter on all legal questions associated with strikes.

As far as our own society is concerned, since strikes have become a reality it obviously has to create its own mechanism for legal regulation of this form of workers' protest. The only point on which I disagree with you is that a strike in an integrated production system can start a chain reaction with negative consequences for people's prosperity. But is there not a chain reaction started by some enterprise's systematic nonfulfillment of its contract and plan commitments? Judging by the store shelves, we all have been on strike for a long time now.

[Feofanov] The entire package of the Final Document's theses refers to the right to judicial protection, legal aid in judicial proceedings, and so on. All this applies to procedural rather than to material rights. I personally think that our procedural law contains an especially large number of inconsistencies with universally recognized norms. From the time a suspect—and at times someone

who is not suspected of anything at all—is detained, right until the time he stands trial, the person in question stands virtually alone against the full might of the investigative authorities: To this day defense attorneys have no access to the preliminary investigation. We still maintain, for all intents and purposes, an inquisitional investigative process. I think and I hope that we will eventually arrive at a civilized process. But how do things stand in America itself? Say, for example, a policeman detains a citizen....

[Vlasikhin] The United States has what I would describe as procedural fetishism. Any procedure associated with the administration of justice has been worked out to the minutest details. The U.S. Constitution mentions the provision concerning the need to observe the "due process of law" twice—in Amendments 5 and 14. But explanations of the meaning of this phrase take up almost 200 pages in the official commentary on the Constitution.

Now about the criminal process in the United States prior to trial. I am convinced that its "due process of law" would put many of our investigators in a state of shock. Just imagine, a policeman or a detective, even when he comes across someone in the very process of committing a crime—catches him "red-handed," in other word—is obliged when snapping on the handcuffs to inform him that he, the detainee, has the right not to make a statement, that he has the right to consult a lawyer who may be present at interrogations, and that a defense lawyer will be appointed before the start of interrogations if the detainee's financial circumstances are such that he is unable to retain a lawyer. If this warning is not given to the detainee and the case reaches the court, the court will dismiss the case without even looking at the question of guilt.

The defense lawyer is present at all investigation stages involving the accused. Warrants for arrest, search, confiscation of property, and similar operational measures (like bugging, for example) are issued by judges and not by the prosecuting attorney [obvinitel]. Following arrest, the accused must be brought before a judge who decides the question of measures to ensure his appearance in court. Since the principle of presumption of innocence is firmly built into the U.S. criminal process, the majority of accused are at liberty before trial—having paid a bond, or having signed an affidavit to appear when summoned, and so on. Remand in custody applies only to people who, in view of their existing record or aggressive inclinations, may pose a real threat to those around them. The judge also holds a preliminary hearing of the case to decide whether there is sufficient evidence to support the charge in further prosecution of the case. Any evidence obtained by the prosecution not in compliance with procedural norms is rejected by the court, and if such evidence happens to be crucial the case is dismissed altogether. Remission for further investigation is totally unknown in U.S. judicial proceedings.

Of course, institutional flaws and direct violations occur in their process. We have written so much about them that there is no point in repeating them.

[Feofanov] There is a "set" of freedoms which are self-evident in a democratic society. What I have in mind are freedom of speech, freedom of conscience, freedom to your own opinion, freedom of thought. "You cannot be tried for your thoughts." But 50 years ago people were shot for their thoughts. Just 5 years ago your own opinion could be expressed only around the kitchen table. Things seem to have changed now, but there are still plenty of brakes. This is why we hear it said: Every "freedom" needs a special law to protect it from encroachments by the bureaucracy. The aforementioned freedoms probably need no legal guarantees in parliamentary democracies: After all, you don't need a law granting you the right to breathe.

[Vlasikhin] Indeed, the Americans proceed from the premise that there is no need for a law "granting the right to breathe." Constitutonal rule in the United States proceeds from this premise: Freedoms like freedom of speech, of conscience, of the press, of assembly, of demonstration, and of association are natural attributes of man, and therefore any detailed legislative regulation of such freedoms can result in their curtailment. Do you know how these freedoms are enshrined in the Constitution? Not by the words "Citizens have the right" or "Citizens are guaranteed the freedom," but as follows: "Congress shall make no law...abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

But U.S. history knows of numerous legislative attempts by the state to loosen the constitutional fetters. Here is just one example. The "Alien Registration Act," better known as the Smith Act, was passed in 1940. One of its articles made it a criminal offense to promote the idea of the need to overthrow any government in the United States. In the late forties, this Act became an instrument for the persecution of Communists as advocates of the idea of the revolutionary overthrow of the capitalist system. During the period of unbridled reaction and McCarthy's "witch-hunt," 29 persons were sentenced under the Smith Act. Freedom of speech and of political beliefs was blatantly trampled. In 1957 the Supreme Court "froze" its effect, and in 1969 it established a mandatory norm that any calls for the overthrow of a government at any level are criminally punishable only when they are acts of incitement to violent actions against institutions of state power and such actions are likely to really occur.

[Feofanov] The participating states affirmed that they would respect the right to free choice and development of their political, social, economic, and cultural systems; to prescribe their own laws and administrative rules. At the same time, as the document says, it is necessary to ensure that they are in harmony with universally

accepted legal principles. This conforms with our present concept: Universal human moral and legal norms must not be overruled by class interests. All this is easier to proclaim than to implement. And it is not a point of us finding it difficult to abandon dogmas, even though this cannot be discounted. After all, here we have an internal contradiction. Really, Vasiliy Anatolyevich, are we the only country where "class interests" exist? The capitalist system is no innocent virgin; it also has its own interests, which probably do not always coincide with the "eternal" principles: Thou shalt not kill, thou shalt not steal, thou shalt not covet any thing that is your neighbor's. How would you appraise "their" legislation from this point of view? Does it need any amendments in the light of the Final Document? You must agree that "The Hand of Vienna" should reach out and touch both sides.

[Vlasikhin] A capitalist state's "class interest" boils down to maintaining and effectively developing the private enterprise system and private ownership relations. The nucleus of U.S. constitutionalism in the sphere of citizens' rights and freedoms comprises the idea of autonomy for the individual owner vis-a-vis the state and, by way of a guarantee of this autonomy, limitation of the state's power by means of certain prohibitions. Of course, the state acts as regulator in broad spheres of social relations, but is not entitled to intervene with impunity or pettiness in matters where relations between free owners and producers predominate. As a matter of fact, U.S. antitrust legislation is an example of powerful intervention by the state in "class interests" (I would borrow many norms of this legislation to tame some of our socialist monopolists).

Frankly speaking, I do not perceive all that much within the framework of U.S. liberal-democratic traditions and normative structures that need be "attuned" to the Vienna document. For example, in order to achieve full conformity, it is exceptionally important to enshrine socioeconomic rights juridically, at constitutional level. In many respects the status of non-white minorities fails to conform with the constitutional idea of "equal protection of the laws." Police abuses and prison guards' violence against inmates are, alas, not a rare occurrence in the United States....

You asked about the need to amend "their" legislation. But what are we to understand by the word "legislation?" Lack of knowledge or lack of comprehension of other countries' legal systems often confuses us when it comes to duly appraising the state of affairs. I recall that during the Watergate crisis some perfectly respectable and educated people said with utmost seriousness: What is Nixon doing, he should take in hand the judge who is so stubbornly after the presidential tapes.

[Feofanov] I am probably not the only one whose interest was aroused by the subtitle of one of the document's sections—"The Human Dimension of the CSCE." As far as I could understand, it deals mainly with information. But the words themselves imply a much broader horizon. Obviously, the "human dimension" must be applied to all actions by authorities and administrative organs. In our own country this right has hitherto been subordinated to the administration. Do you believe that the adoption of the Vienna document and its honest implementation will force the adoption of new laws placing the administration under the law's control? In this context I would like you to address the state of affairs in other countries. How is this "human dimension" interpreted in their legislation?

[Vlasikhin] If we look at the "human dimension" in U.S. jurisprudence, I perceive it primarily in the fact that an individual has at his disposal the widest possible choice of legal and procedural means to defend or restore his rights. They include the institution of the law of torts for sundry civil offenses, the right to request the court to issue mandatory or prohibitive injunctions, the "habeas corpus" procedure which is a judicial inquiry into the legality of any deprivation of freedom, lawsuits for monetary compensation in respect of purely moral damage, the possibility to set constitutional oversight in motion at a court of first instance and take the case up to the Supreme Court, and generally the adversarial judicial procedure for appealing against any administrative actions.

I am profoundly convinced that we have a lot to learn outside our country's borders. The party's course of democratization and expansion of glasnost demands decisive and irreversible rejection of the traditions and tenets of a closed society, and the autarchic development of legal institutions within the framework of a model established "once and for all." If, for reasons of the prestige of power, we reject everything generated by political and legal thinking under other civilized systems, this will in one way or another affect our country's national interests. The stone rejected by the builders may prove to be the cornerstone....

IAEA Expert 'Confident' of AES Design

PM2106143189 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 20 Jun 89 Second Edition p 2

[Interview with Ye. Yaremi, leader of the nuclear installation safety section chief's group from the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), by M. Gusev: "I Share the Anxieties But I Respect Reason: Interview With Canadian Scientist After Expert Analysis of Gorkiy Nuclear Heat Supply Station"—date and place not specified; first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] For the first time specialists from IAEA have carried out an expert analysis of a Soviet nuclear project—the Gorkiy nuclear heat supply station plan. At a session of the I.V. Kurchatov Atomic Energy Institute open discussion club they met with nuclear scientists and members of the public. Our correspondent interviewed Ye. Yaremi (Canada), leader of the IAEA nuclear installation safety section chief's group.

[Gusev] Mr Yaremi, the world today has divided distinctly into supporters and opponents of the nuclear power industry. In addition, a series of accidents at nuclear power stations has increased even more the gulf between them. The plans and calculations of one side are countered by the mass demonstrations of the other. There is no middle ground as far as the peaceful atom is concerned—only extreme positions and no compromises! In virtually all cities people are now categorically opposed to the construction of nuclear electric power stations [AES] next door to them. Gorkiy is no exception, wherever you go in the city. Tell us, are you personally a supporter or an opponent of the nuclear power industry? And who are the more perspicacious—those "for" or those "against".

[Yaremi] We experts who worked in Gorkiy are all convinced supporters of the nuclear power industry. I realize that this may cause mistrust of our study's conclusions. But would the results have been more scientific and objective had they come from fierce opponents of the nuclear power industry? We are professionals, and that is the main point. I share people's anxieties but I also respect reason. There are 428 nuclear stations operating in the world today. And despite what happened at Chernobyl, the number of stations in the 3 years since the accident has increased by 50. It is true that in the immediate future there will be a decline in the number of new stations opening up. The reason for that is that in the developed countries in the past decade a trend toward the more efficient use of electricity has been observed. And some Western countries have begun to doubt the need to increase their nuclear energy capacities. Nevertheless, the energy-saving path is not infinite and economic development is unstoppable. To me personally it is obvious that in the near future they will experience an energy shortage. And energy is not a commodity which can simply be imported: All countries obtain it to the detriment of their own environmental interests.

Thus, economics and ecology force us to answer the question not whether to build stations but how and what kind to build. If not atomic stations then what—those which run on coal, gas, oil, or water power? From the safety angle nothing in this world is perfect. I believe that the nuclear power industry in its environmental impact has advantages over alternative sources. The extreme is not always reasonable. The recent accident in Bashkiria doesn't make you decide to abandon rail transport or gas pipelines.

[Gusev] The environmental cleanliness and economic advantages of the nuclear power industry were mentioned from literally the day that nuclear power as a sector was born. Since Chernobyl, however, there has been a quite natural crisis of confidence in the scientists' reassuring statements.

[Yaremi] That is why, I think, your specialists rightly considered it extremely useful to obtain objective information and enlist world experience and expertise to provide an analysis. Even though the Gorkiy station reactor project has been coordinated with your independent supervisory organ—the State Committee for the Supervision of Safe Working Practices in the Atomic Power Industry [Gosatomenergonadzor].

[Gusev] This, I think, illustrates the belief that "there is no prophet in his own land."

[Yaremi] You have another saying: "Two heads are better than one." And 16 highly qualified specialists from 9 countries is even better, I think. There were experts from the United States, Canada, the FRG, Sweden, Spain, France, Britain, Argentina, and Turkey working in Gorkiy. Openness on nuclear power industry questions is an extra guarantee of safety. The acute need for openness emerged after the accident at a U.S. nuclear power station in 1979. It was then that the exchange of experience among Western countries in this sphere began to be widely practiced. After Chernobyl the Soviet Union actively joined in this process, too. In the case of the Gorkiy station your country took a new and unusual step and proposed a fundamentally new form of cooperation. Until now our agency's analyses were mostly concerned with the quality of operation of the existing stations. This time the plan was subjected to a detailed analysis. We were given all the technical documentation in full and the conditions necessary for our work were provided.

[Gusev] How did you and your colleagues assess the plan?

[Yaremi] It is a good one. It includes all the characteristics which ensure safety. As this is a heat supply station, its parameters are different from those of an AES. Work is possible here at a lower temperature and a lower pressure, approximately one-fifth of the pressure in AES systems. The main heat transport system and the reactor core are housed in a single structure, which removes the need for pumps, pipes, and regenerators and considerably simplifies operation and provides extra guarantees of safety. There is a reliable heat removal system—the transfer of water from the reactor. The station is planned in such a way that it allows the operator to make a mistake by giving him the time and opportunity to correct his actions. Soviet designers chose the right approach by using subassemblies which have been tested in practice in other types of reactors. We were also impressed by the large number of preliminary tests that were carried out.

I think it no wonder that the characteristics of your station are very close to those which have been incorporated independently of Soviet scientists in the plan for a similar station in the FRG. This is no coincidence. It is the direction that world engineering thinking is taking. This is the principle of enhanced safety in action. A further "bonus" of its reactor is that it ensures 100-percent water circulation. Of course, all this information is more interesting to specialists, but for the inhabitants

of Gorkiy it is important to know that the radiation level envisaged in the project in the event of the worst possible accident is considerably lower than the normative requirements and is close to the natural background level.

[Gusev] But suppose you discovered deviations in the project which, in your view, were impermissible? What rights do you have then?

[Yaremi] Our agency's task is to check that nuclear material is always used everywhere solely for peaceful purposes and correctly. In addition to the power industry we also monitor the use of radioisotopes in agriculture, medicine, and industry. We train station personnel to achieve the international standards in work in their own countries and help to improve station plans and computerization.

[Gusev] Mr Yaremi, you said that experts have analyzed the choice of the site. What did you think of it? After all, the proposal is to place the station just 5 km from a city of almost 1.5 million people.

[Yaremi] In Toronto, Canada, a nuclear station is located quite close to the city limits. In the FRG—a country with a very high population density—they are developing a station similar to the Gorkiy one. A heat supply station must be near the city, otherwise you need long pipelines, thus increasing the heat supply cost.

[Gusev] Generally speaking, how good are the prospects for obtaining heat in this way?

[Yaremi] A number of nuclear power stations are already generating steam for industrial purposes now. In Canada, for instance, heat is collected in this way for growing vegetables. In the FRG they are designing a 10-megawatt reactor which will be no larger than a refrigerator. It is intended for use in public buildings, and one will be used in a university.

[Gusev] Our people are worried about the fate of the Volga, from which a vast amount of water is already being taken...

[Yaremi] Water for the operation of the Gorkiy station will not be taken from either the Volga or the Oka—it will be taken exclusively from the city's water supply system. There is no need to increase the water taken from rivers. As for water pollution (even though a discharge is virtually inconceivable), it will be rapidly detected by monitoring of the radiation background. This kind of automatic monitoring will be conducted within a 30 km radius over an area of 2,900 square km. In addition, it is proposed to institute the monitoring program 2 years before the station begins to operate. In that period it will collect data on background contamination—not only radioactive but also chemical. This control system will continue to operate even after the reactor is decommissioned.

[Gusev] Atomic power, even when used for peaceful purposes, produces the very occasion when it is better to err on the side of caution. Is the heat supply station designed for the most unpredictable circumstances—an earthquake, a meteorite, or sabotage, finally?

[Yaremi] A powerful earthquake capable of destroying the station does not threaten the city because Gorkiy, as far as I am aware, is not inside a seismic zone. The station will withstand a direct hit by an aircraft. As for terrorist actions, no country in the world disregards them in its security analysis.

[Gusev] Mr Yaremi, would you subscribe to the following conclusion: That the present station is absolutely reliable, safe, and economically efficient? It is very important for us to know this because similar heat supply systems are being planned for Voronezh and Arkhangelsk.

[Yaremi] We analyzed the station's theoretical safety as incorporated into the plan. As for reliability in operation and economy, that is beyond our remit. For a full picture there will have to be a final analysis. For the time being we have given scientists and engineers a number of recommendations and I think that here we have achieved complete understanding with our partners. Of course, any nuclear installation contains a certain risk but I have every confidence in your station's design.

Rumors of Zaporozhye AES Problems Refuted

18220148 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHEKSAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 17 Jun 89 p 4

[Article by V. Sergeyev: "Everything Is Peaceful at Energodar"]

[Text] Recently, troubling stories have been reaching the oblast center concerning "regular" emissions at the Energodar AES [nuclear electric power station], about a leak in one of the nuclear reactors, about increased radiation, and other "horrors" around Energodar.

To clear up the situation we got in touch with (T. Plokhiye), the plant's chief engineer, and asked him to comment on the current state of the AES.

"No deviations have been noticed in the operating regime of the energy units," (Taras Grigoryevich) said. "All current work is going according to plan. In particular, the first and second units are being repaired. Steam generators are being replaced there, various defects are being eliminated, and other regular operations are going on. I will emphasize once more that there is no basis for the rumors disturbing the population. The radiation level in the city is normal. In conclusion I can add that now we are loading fuel into the fifth reactor. In future months it will come under industrial use, and its energy

will travel along long-distance power lines to the country's national economy. Thus, the inhabitatns of the oblast need not worry—nothing is threatening their health."

Mishandling of Unused Radioactive Devices Discussed
PM1506141589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Jun 89 Second Edition p 6

[PRAVDA correspondent N. Morozov report: "Missing Object and Its Contents. Emergency"]

[Text] Naberezhnyye Chelny, Tatar ASSR—When L. Khodoreva, warehouse manager at the "Polimer" Plant, received the material assets from her predecessor she discovered 46 extra components that looked like miniature electric motors. "What's this?" Khodoreva asked the woman who was retiring. The latter shrugged her shoulders—the components were not registered anywhere. The warehouse manager showed them to plant specialists; they were unable to provide an explanation either. Why keep unneeded scraps of iron in the store room? Khodoreva put the box outside.

By chance, the box came to the notice of S. Mukhutdinov, a medic at the municipal medical and epidemiological center, who immediately sounded the alarm: The "lumps of iron" contained something extremely dangerous. The unowned items were fire-detection devices containing radioactive plutonium-239. Workers at the medical and epidemiological center instructed the plant to immediately hand over the dangerous find for burial. But while talks were under way on this subject, L. Khodoreva once again put the box outside, in fear of radiation.

At the end of May Ye. Gusev, a security equipment engineer, told Khodoreva delightedly: Specialists are coming to bury the radioactive sensors at last. They rushed to look for the box containing the dangerous components, but there was no trace of it. They found only a few smashed casings from the fire-detection devices on the plant's cluttered dumping ground.

Where had the ill-starred box gone? The warehouse manager surmised that it had been taken along with the snow to the municipal dump. But that is only hypothesis. And an extremely depressing one. The radioactive items could fall into the hands of inquisitive lads—then there could be a tragedy. If the capsule containing the plutonium is smashed, adiation burns are inevitable.

The case at the "Polimer" plant is being investigated, and the court will determine the guilt of the specific culprits. Even at a fleeting glance at the incident you can see the scandalous irresponsibility shown by the "Polimer" workers dealing with the radioisotope sensors. Can we believe the enterprise leaders who claim they had no knowledge of the radioactive contents of the fire-detection devices kept in the box? They had only to read the radioactivity warning on the casing of the sensors. Moreover, there were 32 of these detectors stacked in the workshop. Suppose that the leaders were in the dark until last December. But on 9 December a representative from the medical and epidemiological center indicated the danger and drew up a document signed by plant director E. Gasanov. It should have been up to the director to lock the dangerous find away in the safe and assume personal responsibility. Quite the contrary.... He signed this document in a hurry without investigating the heart of the matter. The security equipment engineer displayed the same thoughtless attitude to storing the radioisotope components.

People are seeking to lay the main blame for the incident on the warehouse manager. I don't think the little guy is to blame in this case.

Chairman Salykov on Role of New Ecology Committee
18300690 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 14 Jun 89 Morning Edition p 3

[Interview with Kakimbek Salykovich Salykov, member of the USSR Supreme Soviet, chairman of the committee of the USSR Supreme Soviet for questions of ecology and efficient utilization of natural resources, by Ye. Manucharova; date, place not specified]

[Text] **Kakimbek Salykovich Salykov, a member of the USSR Supreme Soviet, has become the chairman of the committee of the USSR Supreme Soviet for questions of ecology and efficient utilization of natural resources.**

He was born in 1932. By education he is a mining engineer, and he has higher party training. He is no newcomer to deputy work. During the last convention he was chairman of the commission for public education and culture of the Council of the Union. He has a large amount of experience in party work. He was a delegate to the 27th Party Congress and the 19th All-Union Party Conference. He is a member of the CPSU Central Committee and a member of the Bureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Uzbekistan. He is first secretary of the Kara-Kalpak obkom [oblast committee] of the Communist Party of Uzbekistan. He is a poet and a member of the USSR Union of Writers.

[Manucharova] Kakimbek Salykovich! Are you moving from Nukus to Moscow, now that you have won the election?

[Salykov] Naturally. All committee chairmen must live in Moscow. Live and work here....

[Manucharova] How will the committee be formed? Who will be included?

[Salykov] It will consist of people's deputies and members of the USSR Supreme Soviet—half of each. It will have a total of 45-50 members. One can certainly not complain that there are not enough people to form the committee. For the country's most eminent ecologists

have been elected USSR people's deputies. But not only scientists will be members of the committee. It necessarily must include people from various professions—workers, engineers, writers. There is no doubt that all republics will be represented.

[Manucharova] What are the duties and capabilities of your committee? What tasks will it carry out?

[Salykov] The tasks can be divided into two classes: operational and long-term, tactical and strategic.

Twenty percent of the residents of our country live in a zone of ecological disaster. First of all, the committee must seek out real possibilities of helping these people and preventing further development of ecological catastrophes. This is a primary task.

But we must not close our eyes to the fact that there are no ecologically pure territories left in the country as a whole. We have before us a difficult job of an immense scale, and we need a general plan of action. We shall try to make sure that the state ecology program is brought up for public discussion without any red tape. I think that, in keeping with the concept of this program, we shall draw up the entire national economic plan for the next 5-year plan. The ideology of environmental protection is gathering strength in all echelons of management.

[Manucharova] What does that mean in practice?

[Salykov] The position our committee will defend will be that of changing over to an ecologically literate economy.

We shall insist on mandatory enlistment of ecologists for preliminary approval of all national economic projects. This will lead to a better thought-out and more economically substantiated selection of points for new productions. For their location critically affects people's interests and it is not without reason that such heated disputes are now going on concerning the geography of nuclear and hydroelectric power plants and chemical combines.

We shall gradually achieve the mandatory maximum of environmental protection measures for all enterprises everywhere. And also the introduction of new technologies. This is a most important problem.

It is not only that we need technologies which make it possible to increase labor productivity (which means constructing fewer plants). The main advantage of modern technologies is that they eliminate harmful discharges and save on natural resources.

We must introduce parliamentary hearings at which we bring up all crucial problems. The committees of the Supreme Soviet have immense possibilities of enlisting any number of experts in their work. We shall take advantage of this right to monitor the level of the plans and technologies through the efforts of specialists who are independent of the departments.

We must draw on our country's active intellectual potential. And not only ours—when the situation is especially difficult such as, say, in the Aral area. The catastrophic situation is now forcing Kara-Kalpakia, through the USSR Academy of Sciences, to turn to the United Nations. They have useful experience in saving Lake Chad in Africa. It can be used to save the Aral.

[Manucharova] So are you relying on science?

[Salykov] And on a rule-of-law state. We must not delay in the matter of developing ecology law. Legal mechanisms can be used to regulate the actions of businesses. We need established norms of the minimum possible pollution of the environment and the introduction of criminal and administrative sanctions for violating them. Right down to closing down productions that pollute. Ecological crimes must not go unpunished.

In Kara-Kalpakia we became convinced in practice of the effectiveness of legal mechanisms in protecting the environment. With the help of the USSR Procurator we created our own environmental protection procurator.

We must carefully keep track of efficient implementation of the ecological law on protection of the environment. For it is quite possible that new legally binding acts will appear with which the departments will try to neutralize its effect.

[Manucharova] I think that you simply do not want to come to a full agreement. You will probably have to deal with crime. Including organized crime. And even with international lobbies—after all, rich people will always be interested in resources.... I have another question. The ecological situation in the country is handled by a number of organizations—the USSR State Committee for Protection of Nature, the USSR Gosplan [State Planning Committee], the USSR Academy of Sciences, and the USSR State Committee for Hydrometeorology. All of them have scientific institutes. And all of them are duplicated by ecological organizations in the republics. There are many specialists.... What can your committee do in addition to all this?

[Salykov] We are aware of how difficult our work will be. But it was even more difficult for our predecessors. The main thing was that among the multitude of organizations there was not a single one that had the right to coordinate the actions of the others, that had the high-level legal and legislative authority. We have this.

Moreover, up to this point all the organizations have worked under the difficult conditions when the local authorities were powerless before the departments. I shall give you this sad example. In certain regions of Kara-Kalpakia during the years of stagnation the party

raykoms [rayon committees] built expensive buildings for themselves. They spent millions on them. And there was not enough money for building up the village. These "prestigious" buildings were built with money obtained from workers in in the regions of the Ministry of Land Reclamation and Water Resources—it was permitted to disfigure the land in exchange for satisfaction of the wishes of the apparatus.

Regional cost accounting radically changes the situation. The local organizations are ordering their own work and paying for it themselves. All the responsibility is theirs. They have the right to choose the quality of services. This is very important when it is intended to introduce payment for water. There are hardly any regions that would be willing to invest money if they are offered irrigation systems in which all maximum permissible concentrations of harmful substances are exceeded.

Now the regions will not merely sigh romantically about the former purity of the region; they will be able actually to take the necessary radical measures—the economic, legal, and sociopolitical mechanisms will be in their hands.

Initially these relations which are new to the country will require our parliamentary control.

[Manucharova] This is the most common word in our great state—"control." It is like a panacea....

[Salykov] Control is necessary. But it is certainly no alternative to new forms of management. There is no such thing as an automatic mechanism without feedback. I say this as an engineer. And also as a politician.

There are new ideas of control. For example, every resident will receive a chart of the complete ecological situation. The specialists who developed the state ecology program will work on its creation. We will also try to arrange it so that the residents receive information about the condition of the environment in their region. So that they will receive it regularly and without distortions. In carrying out both tasks I think we shall be able to do without cosmic information about the planet.

[Manucharova] We have the most dangerous ecological situation in the country. It seems that we are at the limit.... But you are extremely optimistic. Are there reasons for this?

[Salykov] Undoubtedly. In my opinion we have a powerful sociopolitical movement growing here. The country has rallied together in a desire to strictly protect its environment. Both the people and the government understand how crucial the ecological situation is. It is not without reason that at the congress N.I. Ryzhkov spoke of the need to "give the green light" to the USSR Council of Ministers. I can agree with you that man has pushed nature to an extremely dangerous limit. Nonetheless we have strong hopes of stabilizing the situation. A new ecological world view is extremely important. Our committee will contribute to the development of ecological knowledge and ecological education—in the schools, tekhnikums, VUZ's [higher educational institutions], and enterprises. For there is not nor can there be a qualified specialist without an ecological education. There is not nor can there be a patriot among those who destroy the homeland.

It seems to me that the rapid proliferation of "green" movements among the youth is undoubtedly a positive phenomenon. there is no need to label them "informal groups." Pluralism of opinions is the spiritual wealth of the society. In our work our committee will rely on all the active forces of the people and on our young "green" shoots.

Health Ministry 'Guilty' in Spread of AIDS

LD1706195289

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1900 GMT on 16 June in its "View" program broadcasts a 5-minute report by MOSCOW NEWS reporter (Yevgeniya Albats) on the AIDS situation in the Soviet Union in the wake of the infection of 58 chidren in Elista and 23 in Volgograd.

(Albats) says: "No mother in the Soviet Union today can be guaranteed that her child will not be infected with AIDS.... You see, our maternity hospitals are simply made for AIDS to spread uncontrollably and for AIDS to infect children and adults uncontrollably. There is filfth, the absence of disposable products, one toilet for a post-natal ward containing 70 women...one toilet and not a single shower for 70 women.... Eighty percent of maternity hospitals in Moscow—the capital—are infected with staphylococcus. When I spoke about this to the Ministry of Health they said: 'What are you going on about?—staphylococcus is a mere trifle, a gram-negative infection.' So I can now tell you that staphylococcus is a trifle, you might not die from it. AIDS is the horror that has hit us all now."

According to (Albats), despite Ministry of Health instructions, women are not being tested for AIDS on entering maternity hospitals, due to a "disastrous shortage of diagnostic equipment and testing equipment for AIDS checks on blood.... There is, in effect, only one qualified laboratory in the country—the central laboratory in the Central Epidemiological Institute in Moscow. This is worse than any civilized country in the world. According to the Second International AIDS Symposium, infection through dirty syringes occurs only in Africa—and the Soviet Union." (Albats) notes that to "save our children," 1,790,500,000 syringes are needed, while at best there will only be 1,200 million by 1991.

(Albats) says that the USSR Ministry of Health is "guilty" because it "did nothing" in the last 5 years when the AIDS epidemic was already spreading in the West.

"We made no sensible preparations and consoled ourselves by saying that we had one AIDS patient and all the others were foreigners. We went on endlessly about that at every level, deceiving the country. This simply shows that we don't know how to make diagnoses. The infection was developing uncontrollably, as the specialists warned." (Albats) explains that the authorities' actions were due to a fear of being punished, rather than concern for people's lives—"mass irresponsibility." Scarce foreign currency must be allocated for the import of disposable medical items.

"View" presenter V. Listev adds that according to the latest figures, 112 children are currently infected with AIDS in the USSR. "In the West, as we know, the main source of AIDS infection is the so-called risk group—drug addicts, prositutes, and homosexuals. In our country, however plasphemous it may sound, the main source of AIDS infection is the health care bodies and their polyclinics and hospitals."

Independent Paper To Be Published 'This Month'
LD1706204189

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1900 GMT on 16 June in its "View" program broadcasts a 4-minute report by journalist (Yevgeniy Dodelev), who introduces a new newspaper entitled TOP SECRET [SOVERSHENNO SEKRETNO] which goes to press "later this month". (Dodelev) is a member of the editorial board. The paper is being published as a supplement to the journal DETECTIVES AND POLITICS [DETEKTIV I POLITIKA] run by the International Association for Detective and Political Novels, founded and directed by writer Yulian Semenov. According to (Dodelev), TOP SECRET will be "the first independent publication, in effect, since we are neither an organ of the Central Committee nor of any department." It will deal partly with political matters, its primary aim being "the evolution of a law-governed state." (Dodolev) explains, however, that "we shall maintain neutrality—we do not wish to get into the civil war that has now broken out between the journals. We do not wish to adjoin either the liberal or fascist camp—nominally speaking." The journal will offer rewards for information leading to the capture of dangerous criminals. The initial print run will be 1 million copies.

The first issue will contain an "exclusive interview" with William Sessions, director of the FBI. Dodelev hopes that he will also succeed in interviewing KGB Chairman Kryuchkov. The paper will cooperate closely with foreign journalists in Moscow and even hand over some articles for them to publish "since the censorship that exists today is in fact a little oppressive".

Dodelev expresses the hope that TOP SECRET will become an organ of Interpol, and says that Yulian Semenov is currently touring Europe to discuss the matter.

Economic

Minister Interviewed on Defense Sector Conversion
PM2106083189 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 14 Jun 89 First Edition p 2

[Interview with L. Ryabev, USSR minister of medium machine building, by correspondent A. Vorobyev under the "Conversion of Military Production" rubric: "In Place of Nuclear Weapons"—date and place unspecified]

[Text] L. Ryabev, USSR minister of medium machine building and one of the leaders of the country's defense complex, answers our correspondent's questions.

[Vorobyev] Lev Dmitriyevich, it is no longer a secret that the USSR Ministry of Medium Machine Building works on questions of nuclear equipment and nuclear weapons production. Now the concept of conversion—one that is new to many of us—has appeared, singifying the transfer of military potential to the solution of peaceful economic and social problems. Presumably something has already been done in that direction, has it?

[Ryabev] In addition to weapons and military hardware, the sector's enterprises are now producing a considerable quantity of industrial output for the national economy. In the process 2.2 million tonnes of mineral fertilizers are being produced for agriculture, some of which is being sold in small quantities to the population through the trade network. Various chemical products (acids, resins, and fluoroplastics) worth more than R500 million are being produced. Metals such as molybdenum and tantalum, for example, are also being produced.

The sector is a major national producer of gold, emeralds, various isotopes, medical equipment, and other output. So, long before the program to convert our sector was adopted, practical steps were being taken to put it to new use.

[Vorobyev] You mentioned a "conversion program." Could you tell us about that in more detail?

[Ryabov] We have produced and are already actively implementing measures on the large-scale transfer of the sector to the solution of the food problem. Our ministry has been instructed to retool enterprises for milk processing and to organize servicing for them.

We were given 10 enterprises from the now-abolished USSR Ministry of Machine Building for Light and Food Industry and Household Appliances which used to produce manufacturing equipment for the dairy industry. These plants were in an extremely dilapidated state. We have to modernize them ourselves even to the point of demolishing old buildings and erecting new ones. "In the process" we have also accepted a social program: The collectives of those enterprises are in acute need of housing. We shall try to resolve that task, too. People must be given conditions for normal work.

Even after modernization, however, the plants transferred to us cannot resolve the problem of producing equipment in the necessary quantities. Furthermore, Soviet equipment has become obsolete, only one-fourth of it meets world standards. In addition, 400 types of machinery have to be redesigned or substantially modernized.

Specific orders for the production of equipment for the country's dairy enterprises have been received by more than 40 of our sector's enterprises. Enterprises which used to produce military equipment are being converted for that purpose. It is also planned to build four or five specialized production units. It will be necessary to create fundamentally new equipment sets and develop production lines using microprocessor technology.

To achieve the maximum proximity to both milk producers and dairy product consumers we are also aiming to create small plants built from modular sections capable of processing 5-10 tonnes of milk per shift. I think that such enterprises are needed, for example, in the Russian Non-Chernozem Zone.

The sector's entire technical and scientific potential is involved in the solution of the problem. Twenty-five chief designers have been appointed. New, improved milk reception, purification, and pasteurization equipment is being actively planned. The designs for comprehensive lines for the production of sour cream, curd cheese, and other sour milk produce as well as cheese have been prepared.

We are planning fairly high rates of growth for the production of manufacturing equipment for dairy industry enterprises. Whereas 2 years ago, at the time that the Ministry of Machine Building for Light and Food Industry and Household Appliances' enterprises were being transferred to our sector, equipment production amounted to R145 million, production this year, 1989, will amount to R310 million, in 1995 to R670 million, and in 2000 to more than R1 billion. Work to create the necessary capacities for the production of equipment must be fulfilled as quickly as possible. The capital investments for this purpose are now five times higher than previously planned.

Talks are being held with a Western firm for the creation of a joint venture to introduce improved techniques and ensure the more comprehensive extraction of valuable constituents from milk—protein, sugar, and so forth. In Cherkassy Oblast we are cooperating with a Swedish firm to build a joint production unit for the manufacture of automated milk bottling and packaging lines. Packaging materials will be produced in addition to automatic machinery.

[Vorobyev] We would like to know what else the ministry is planning in consumer goods production.

[Ryabev] The second important area in the sector's orientation on the solution of social tasks is the organization of large-scale production of non-food consumer goods.

Because of the sector's specific features we were for a long time one of the lowest-placed among the defense ministries in the production of non-food consumer goods. This year, for instance, we will produce goods worth in all R228 million. In the future, however, we are going to work at a qualitatively new level. In 1990 we will supply the market with consumer goods to the tune of R382 million. The control figure to be achieved in 1995 is R1.2 billion and in 2000 R2 billion.

In addition, next year we will produce food goods worth R310 million.

[Vorobyev] Incidentally, it is common knowledge that your sector is producing commodities that are in short supply...

[Ryabev] I do not think that our output will be on the shelf for long. In the very near future we are going to organize the production of video equipment: We are creating a unit to produce computers for schools; and on the basis of the existing technologies for the production of lithium—a material in short supply—we plan to create a large unit for the production of chemical sources of electricity—batteries for watches and clocks, transistors, and various household appliances. A new type of long-life domestic storage battery is being developed.

The question of organizing the production of domestic refrigerators and refrigerator compressors is being worked on. We are also planning to organize the production of color television tubes and monitors. We are going to build plants to produce domestic medical equipment—worth R80 million a year—in Krasnoyarsk Kray and we have begun organizing the production of toothpaste at a combine in Shevchenko city. Customers will be able to obtain the first tubes next year.

Of course, the implementation of this program will require great efforts and substantial capital investments. It will be necessary to buy abroad the special equipment and automated production lines which the Soviet Union does not produce and to find ways to pay for these purchases, including barter deals, as well as using the sector's foreign currency income. In short, we have more than enough problems. We sometimes joke that it was easier to create the nuclear weapon than some consumer goods.

[Vorobyev] But why is that?...

[Ryabev] We have difficulties with raw and other materials. To organize the production of non-food consumer goods we need considerable quantities of different materials and the corresponding resources and components. We cannot do all this by ourselves. We are also currently experiencing a shortage of the polyethylene, polystyrene,

polypropylene, and dyes produced by the Ministry of the Chemical Industry for the same reason. It is the same with components and small electric motors (produced by the USSR Ministry of the Electrical Equipment Industry). We have been forced to organize partial production of these at our own enterprises.

We decided to ensure manpower availability primarily by releasing [surplus] workers. Our sector's enterprises and construction sites are ready to accept servicemen who are to be released under the reduction of the Armed Forces.

[Vorobyev] One last question, Lev Dmitriyevich. As is well known, in the next 2 years the volume of arms production will be reduced by almost one-fifth. This year it has been decided to cut production of highly enriched uranium for military purposes. In addition to the industrial reactor for the processing of weapons-grade plutonium closed back in 1987 it is planned to close down two more such reactors in 1989-1990, without commissioning new capacities to replace them.

Thus, a systematic conversion is planned—the proportion of civilian output in the total production of the defense complex will rise from 40 percent this year to 60 percent in 1995. Will that weaken our defense might?

[Ryabev] I was in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses in a guest capacity throughout the work of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies. On more than one occasion I heard that question from deputies. There is just one answer here, I think: The country must not allow the principle of reasonable sufficiency for defense to be violated.

Agricultural

Agricultural Developments for 15-20 Jun Reported

LD2206021189

[Editorial Report] The following is a compilation of reports on agricultural developments in the USSR carried by Moscow Domestic Service in Russian on 15-20 June, unless indicated otherwise. Times of broadcast, given in GMT, are in parentheses at the end of each item.

15 June

Green pea harvesting is under way in Krasnodar Kray. To date about 40,000 metric tons—half of the quantity planned—has been delivered. (1100)

16 June

Grasses from the first crop have been cut on nearly half the area in Belorussia. (0204)

17-18 June

No fileworthy items monitored.

19 June

All oblasts in Kazakhstan are harvesting grasses over an area of 32 million hectares. Two million hectares have been harvested. About 1 million metric tons of hay have been delivered to cattle-wintering places, and 1 million metric tons of haylage have been stored. The cold spring has meant slower progress than last year. (0800)

20 June

Farms in Altay have begun haymaking. (1300)

Farmers in Kabardino-Balkariya have begun harvesting winter wheat. (1300)

Kazakhstan machine operators have completed the first tilling of fallow ground. Five million hectares of arable land have been set aside for next year's harvest. In the republic, with its arid steppe climate, fallow ground is an integral part of the crop rotation. Careful tilling makes it possible to destroy weeds over large areas and to accumulate the necessary moisture reserve for the next sowing. Practice over many years has shown that fallow land usually produces a more plentiful harvest of grain crops than on late fall plowed fields. The fallow areas are tilled with subsurface tillers. This protects the soil from the steppe winds and erosion. (2230)